

Vol. XXIV.

JULY, 1947.

No. 3

# THE AUSTRALASIAN Catholic Record

FOR CLERGY  
AND RELIGIOUS



*The Official Organ for communications issued by the  
Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.*

# Announcements

CORRESPONDENCE: All correspondence should be addressed to Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all Queries.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: *Yearly, in advance, 12/-.*

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque. Notice of change of address should be sent to the Manager.

*The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.*

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—A.C.R. Staff.

Archdiocese of Perth—V. Rev. John T. McMahon, South Perth, W.A.

Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. J. L. Dunn, Wellington, N.Z.

Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.

Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. Brian Carmichael, Mitchelton, Q.

Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. J. Wallis, Launceston, Tas.

Diocese of Armidale—Rev. J. Healy, Armidale, N.S.W.

Diocese of Auckland—Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Parnell, N.Z.

Diocese of Ballarat—V. Rev. J. P. Walsh, R.I., V.F. St. Arnaud, Vic.

Diocese of Bathurst—V. Rev. M. J. Dunne, B.A., Adm. Bathurst, N.S.W.

Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.

Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, Dunedin, N.Z.

Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. Bryan Gallagher, Ph.d., Three Springs, W.A.

Diocese of Goulburn—V. Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Cobargo, N.S.W.

Diocese of Lismore—V. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., Smithtown, N.S.W.

Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Waratah, N.S.W.

Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.

Diocese of Rockhampton—Rev. D. G. Tiernan, Rockhampton, N.Q.

Diocese of Sale—V. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, Vic.

Diocese of Sandhurst—Rev. J. Hussey, Shepparton, Vic.

Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Allora, Q.

Diocese of Townsville—Very Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.

Diocese of Wagga—V. Rev. J. H. Larkins, Wagga, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes—Very Rev. Dean J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.

Editor: REV. T. VEECH,

Manager: REV. C. KELLER,

St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

# The Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

## Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS . . . . .	181
Apostolic Constitution on Canonical States and secular Institutes.	
CHRIST AND CANTERBURY, I,	
Rev. Thomas Muldoon, D.D.	193
LYNDHURST AND BENEDICTINE EDUCATION, IV,	
M. Forster, B.A., Dip. Ed.	205
NATURE OF DIVINE VOCATION TO THE	
PRIESTHOOD . . . . . Rev. H. J. Jordan, M.S.C.	210
MORAL THEOLOGY . . . . . Very Rev. James Madden, D.D.	222
<i>Parochus Putativus</i> and marriage—Obligation of Chemist's assistant —Sufficient matter for the Sacrament of Penance—Time for fulfilling Mass obligations—Communion of the Sick and Eucharistic Fast.	
CANON LAW . . . . . Very Rev. James Carroll, D.C.L., P.P.	232
<i>Sanatio in radice</i> —Effect of <i>Sanatio</i> when marriage remains <i>non consummatum</i> .	
LITURGY . . . . .	239
Ceremony of Ordination (contd.)—Communion Cloth—Manner of wearing stole—Anniversary Mass for deceased Priest—Nuptial Mass —Position of Missal after last Gospel—A Sodality matter.	
HOMILETICS . . . . . Rev. Walter Baker, D.D., Ph.D.	246
Instructions for Men, III., Revelation.	
NOTES . . . . .	251
Is St. John chapter 5 misplaced?—New Theology—Facts and Figures — <i>Principium qui et loquor vobis</i> .	
BOOK REVIEWS . . . . .	266
<i>L'Enseignement de Saint Pierre</i> (Thils); <i>Preface to Religion</i> (Sheen); <i>Theology and Sanity</i> (Sheed); <i>"Regionalism in Australia"</i> (Maher); <i>Democracy in Australia</i> (Murtagh); <i>La Fiamma</i> ; <i>The</i> <i>Kings of the Earth</i> (Owen); <i>Life and Adventures of St. Iginus</i> (McGuire); <i>Mystic in Motley</i> (Maynard).	



**Nihil Obstat :**

RICHARDUS COLLENDER

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

**Imprimatur :**

✠ N.T. CARD. GILROY,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

Die 1a Julii, 1947.

# Official Documents

## PAPAL ACTS

### APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTION

*on canonical States and secular Institutes  
for the acquiring of Christian perfection*

### PIUS BISHOP

Servant of the servants of God  
for a perpetual remembrance of the matter.

The Church is a provident Mother, and her maternal affection is concerned in a particular way with those children of predilection<sup>1</sup> who devote their whole life to Christ our Lord, striving to follow Him freely and laboriously along the way of the counsels. Such particular care of the great provident ecclesiastical Mother to make these special children of hers continually worthy of their heavenly purpose and angelic vocation<sup>2</sup> is amply attested by a long series of documents and monuments from the hands of Pontiffs, Councils and Fathers. Even the whole course of ecclesiastical history and the whole drift of canonical legislation up to our own times show how the Church has continually taken maternal and provident action to order the lives of those disciples of Christian perfection wisely.

Indeed, from the days when Christianity was, as it were, still in its cradle, the teachings and examples of Christ<sup>3</sup> and of His Apostles<sup>4</sup>—such namely, as invited souls to the way of perfection were studiously set forth in the ordinary exercise of the Church's magisterium. In no uncertain way she showed how a life dedicated to perfection should be lived and fittingly ordered. By her work and her ministry the Church strongly cherished and propagated complete surrender and consecration to Christ, for in the fervour of those first days the Christian communities spontaneously offered excellent soil for the evangelical counsels—a

---

<sup>1</sup>Pius XI, *Nuncium radiophonicum*, 12 febr., 1931 (*ad religiosos*). Cfr. A.A.S. XXIII (1931) 67.

<sup>2</sup>Cfr. Tertullianus, *Ad uxorem*, lib. I, c. IV (ML 1, 1281); Ambrosius, *De virginibus*, I, 3, 11 (ML 16, 202); Eucherius Lugdun., *Exhortatio ad Monachos*, 1 (ML 50, 865); Bernardus, *Epistola CDXLIX* (ML 182, 641), id., *Apologia ad Guillelmum*, c. X (ML 182, 912).

<sup>3</sup>Mt. XVI, 24; XIX, 10-12, 16-21; Mk. X, 17-21, 23-30; Lk. XVIII, 18-22, 24-29 XX, 34-36.

<sup>4</sup>1 Cor., VII, 25-35, 38-37, 40; Mt. XIX, 27; Mk. X, 28; Lk. XVIII, 28; Acts XXI, 8-9; Apoc. XIV, 4-5.



soil well prepared for the seed, and giving sure promise of splendid fruits.<sup>5</sup> Soon after, as can be easily shown from the Apostolic Fathers and earlier ecclesiastical writers<sup>6</sup> the profession of a life of perfection was already so flourishing in various churches, that those who professed it formed, as it were, an order and a social class which were clearly recognized and also widely approved and honoured.<sup>7</sup> They were known under different names—ascetics, celibates, virgins etc. They began to constitute distinct groups within the bosom of the ecclesiastical society.

In the course of the centuries the Church, always faithful to Christ her Spouse and always consistent, progressed with a progress of sure and continual development in this matter, ever acting under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The result of this gradual development is embodied in the present legislation contained in the Code of Canon Law, in the section which sets forth the discipline of the state of perfection. The Church has continued to show that same maternal propensity towards those who of their own free will, according to different forms, have externally and publicly professed perfection of life. In a purpose so holy she has never ceased to give them her entire favour, and that under a twofold respect. In the first place the Church has not only received that venerable profession of perfection made before the Church herself with public solemnity—such, namely, as we see in the ancient and venerable liturgical blessing and consecration of virgins<sup>8</sup>—but she has furthermore wisely sanctioned and defended it, even attributing to it many canonical effects. However, the chief favour of the Church and her more diligent care rightly came to be shown and

<sup>5</sup>Lk. VIII, 15; Acts IV, 32, 34-35; 1 Cor. VII, 25-35, 37-38, 40; Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica*, III, 39 (MG 20, 297).

<sup>6</sup>Ignatius, *Ad Polycarp.*, V (MG 5, 724); Polycarpus, *Ad Philippen.*, V, 3 (MG 5, 1009); Iustinus Philosophus, *Apologia I pro christianis* (MG 6, 349); Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata* (MG 8, 224); Hippolytus, *In Proverb.* (MG 10, 628); id., *De Virgine Corinthiaca* (MG 10, 871-874); Origenes, *In Num. hom.*, 2, 1 (MG 12, 590); Methodius, *Convivium decem virginum* (MG 18, 27-200); Tertullianus, *Ad uxorem*, lib. I, c. VII-VIII (ML 1, 1286-1287); id., *De resurrectione carnis*, c. VIII (ML 2, 806); Cyprianus, *Epistola XXXVI* (ML 4, 327); id., *Epist. LXII*, 11 (ML 4, 336); id., *Testimon. adv. judaeos*, lib. III, c. LXXXIV (ML 4, 771); Ambrosius, *De viduis*, II, 9 et sqq. (ML 16, 250-251); Cassianus, *De tribus generibus monachorum*, V (ML 49, 1094); Athenagoras, *Legatio pro christianis* (MG 6, 965).

<sup>7</sup>Acts XXI, 8-10; cfr. Ignatius Antioch., *Ad Smyrn.*, XIII (MG 5, 717); id., *Ad Polyc.*, V (MG 5, 723); Tertullianus, *De virginibus velandis* (ML 2, 935 sqq.); id., *De exhortatione castitatis*, c. XII (ML 2, 922); Cyprianus, *De habitu virginum*, II (ML 4, 443); Hieronimus, *Epistola LVIII*, 4-6 (ML 22, 582, 583); Augustinus, *Sermo CCXIV* (ML 38, 1070); id., *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*, lib. V, c. IX (ML 42, 226).

<sup>8</sup>Cfr. Optatus, *De schismate donatistarum*, lib. VI (ML 11, 1071 sqq.); Pontificale Romanum, II: *De benedictione et consecratione Virginum*.

exercised towards that full profession of perfection which was more strictly public. We mean that profession which from the first times, after the peace of Constantine, was made in societies and colleges erected with the permission and approbation and appointment of the Church herself.

The close and intimate connection of the history of the Church's sanctity and catholic apostolate with the history and events of canonical religious life is very evident. It is to the grace of the Holy Spirit always endowing the Church with new vitality that such wonderful variety, such continual growth and such vigour of religious life are due. And in the Church it has ever more and more tended to acquire the mark of higher and stronger unity. It is no wonder, then, that the Church, even in the province of law, has faithfully maintained the line of action so clearly indicated by the provident Wisdom of God. She has deliberately favoured and ordered the canonical state of perfection in such manner as a wise architect, building upon it her edifice of ecclesiastical discipline as upon one of her cornerstones. Hence, in the first place, the public state of perfection was numbered amongst the three chief ecclesiastical states, and from it exclusively the Church has taken the second order of canonical persons (c. 107). This is a matter for attentive consideration. While the other two orders of canonical persons, namely, clergy and laity, exist by divine ordinance, to which ecclesiastical institution is added (cc. 107, 108 § 3)—while those two orders result in the Church inasmuch as it is a Society hierarchically constituted and ordered, this class consisting of religious is midway between clergy and laity and can be common to both clerics and lay folk (107). This third and middle state takes its rise entirely from its close and special relation to the end of the Church, namely, the quest for sanctification by efficacious and adequate means.

Nor was this enough. To prevent the frustration or failure of the public and solemn profession of holiness, the Church has always willed, with ever greater rigour, to recognize the canonical state of perfection only in societies erected and appointed by herself, that is to say, in religious societies, technically called *Religions*. These it has been her custom to approve only after a mature and slow examination of their form and character. She has subjected to her magisterium, in each case, their institute and statutes not only doctrinally and in the abstract, weighing them in the balance again and again, but she has submitted them to the test of actual experiment. These points are defined in the Code of Canon Law with such severity and absoluteness,



that in no case, not even by way of exception, is the canonical state of perfection acknowledged, unless profession thereof is made in a Religious Society approved by the Church. Finally, the canonical discipline of the state of perfection, inasmuch as it is a public state, has been so wisely ordered by the Church as to give clerical religious societies a very special standing. Actually clerical "Religions", in those things generally which regard the clerical life of the Religious, take the place of a diocese, enrolment in a clerical religious Institute being equivalent to the incardination of a cleric into a diocese (cc. 111, § I; 115; 585).

The Code of Pius X and Benedict XV in Part 2, book 2 (devoted to Religious) digested the carefully collected, critically sifted and diligently elaborated legislation on Religious, thus confirming the canonical state of perfection even under its public aspect. At the same time it wisely perfected the work begun by Leo XIII in his immortal Constitution, "*Conditae a Christo*",<sup>9</sup> admitting congregations of simple vows amongst "Religions" strictly so called. When this work had been done by the Codex, nothing additional seemed to be needed in regard to the discipline of the canonical state of perfection. The Church, however, with that great breadth of view and conception which belongs to her, thought fit to add, in a characteristically maternal way, a brief title to that religious legislation, as a supplement demanded by the times. In the said title (tit. XVII, Lib. II) she judged well to regard as also belonging in a sufficiently full sense to the canonical state of perfection societies which were often full of merits even towards civil well-being, and which, although not having certain juridical solemnities necessary for the complete canonical state of perfection (public vows, for instance; cc. 488, 1<sup>o</sup> and 7<sup>o</sup>; 487) bear none the less very close similarity and affinity to "Religions" in the full sense. They are like them in all that pertains to the substantial requirements of a life of perfection.

When all these things had been wisely, prudently and lovingly set in order, ample provision had been made for the multitude of souls who desired to leave the world and embrace the new canonical state of perfection strictly so called—a state wholly and entirely consecrated to the acquisition of perfection. But the loving Lord, Who without any acceptance of persons<sup>10</sup> again and again invited<sup>11</sup> all the faithful to perfec-

<sup>9</sup>Const. "*Conditae a Christo Ecclesiae*", 8 dec. 1900, cfr. Leonis XIII Act, vol. XX, 317-327.

<sup>10</sup> 2 *Par.* IX, 7; *Rom.* II, 11; *Eph.* VI, 9; *Col.* III, 25.

<sup>11</sup>*Mt.* V, 48; XIX, 12; *Col.* IV, 12; *James* I, 4.



tion, also disposed, by a wonderful counsel of His Providence, that even in the world, depraved by so many vices, especially in our own times, many should have distinguished themselves and are distinguishing themselves as flowers of perfection. They are bands of chosen souls, who not only aspire with all fervour after individual perfection, but remaining in the world in obedience to a special vocation of God, can find excellent new forms of Associations corresponding to the needs of the times, wherein they can lead a life very suitable to the acquisition of Christian perfection.

Warmly commending the noble strivings of individual souls to the prudence and zeal of Spiritual Directors in the internal forum, We are now solicitous about Associations which in the face of the Church, that is, in the external forum, endeavour to lead their members to a life of solid perfection. There is not, however, question here of all Associations which sincerely pursue Christian perfection in the world, but of those only which in internal constitution, in a hierarchical order of government, in a full consecration not limited by other ties—such a consecration being required by these Associations from their members—in the profession of the evangelical counsels, in the way of exercising their ministries and their apostolate, more nearly approach, as far as substance goes, to the canonical states of perfection, and are more especially in close affinity to Societies which have not public vows (tit. XVII), although they do not use common religious life, but other external forms.

These Associations, which henceforth shall be called by the name of "Secular Institutes" began to be founded in the first half of the last century, under a special impulse of Divine Providence. Their aim was "to follow the evangelical counsels in the world and to perform offices of charity with more liberty, since on account of the bad conditions of the times religious families were almost entirely or even totally prevented from exercising such offices".<sup>12</sup> When older Institutes of this type had given a good account of themselves; when they were continually proving themselves more and more in works and deeds, it was seen that through a severe and prudent selection of members, through a careful and sufficiently long formation, through an adequate, strong and flexible order of life, it was certainly possible to obtain even in the world, under the favour of a special vocation of God and with the help of divine grace, a really

---

<sup>12</sup>S.C. Episcoporum et Regularium dec. "Ecclesia Catholica", d. 11 augusti 1889; cfr. A.S.S. XXIII, 634.

sufficiently strict and efficacious consecration of oneself to the Lord—a consecration not merely internal but even external and almost religious. At the same time here was a most opportune instrument of penetration and apostolate. For these manifold reasons “those Societies of faithful Christians were praised in the same way as true religious Congregations by the Holy See”, and that more than once.<sup>13</sup>

As these Institutes happily grew and flourished, it appeared more clearly every day in how many ways they might be turned to the purpose of efficaciously helping the Church and immortal souls. They could indeed be used and turned with great ease to a variety of purposes: to the serious exercise of a life of perfection always and everywhere; to the embracing of such a life in many cases wherein canonical religious life was not possible or was not the most suitable course; to a vigorous Christian renewal of families, professions, and civil society through intimate and daily contact with a life perfectly and entirely consecrated to the pursuit of holiness; to manysided apostolic work and to ministrations in places, times and circumstances not within the reach of priests or religious. On the other hand experience proved that difficulties and dangers were not wanting in such a life of perfection. Lived as it was, under conditions of great freedom, without the external safety of a religious habit, without the help of community intercourse, without the vigilance of the Ordinaries to whom it might easily remain unknown, without the supervision of Superiors who frequently were at a great distance, it sometimes—and very easily, too—involved those very difficulties and dangers. Moreover, disputes arose about the juridical character of those Institutes and about the mind of the Holy See in approving them. Here We deem it opportune to make mention of the Decree “*Ecclesia Catholica*” given by the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars on the 11th day of August of the year 1889 and confirmed by Our Predecessor of immortal memory, Leo XIII (ASS, XXIII, 634). In that decree the commendation and approbation of such Institutes were not excluded; it was added, however, that when the Sacred Congregation praised or approved those Institutes, it wished to praise and approve them “not as ‘Religions’ of solemn vows or as true religious Congregations of simple vows, but only as pious sodalities, in which (besides other things which are required by the present discipline of the Church) there was no religious profession properly so called, but vows, if vows were made, were considered to be private vows, that is, not public vows which are accepted in the name of the Church by a

---

<sup>13</sup>S.C. Episcoporum et Regularium dec. “*Ecclesia Catholica*”.



lawful Superior. Furthermore, these Sodalities—so the same Congregation added—are praised or approved on the essential condition of their being perfectly and fully known to the local Ordinary in each case, and of their being unequivocally subject to his jurisdiction. These ordinances and declarations of the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars contributed in a very opportune way towards determining the nature of those Institutes. The Sacred Congregation's enactments ordered the development and progress of the Institutes, without impeding them.

In this present century Secular Institutes have silently increased. Many of them have taken different forms, either as autonomous entities or as united in various ways to religious Orders or Societies. For them the Apostolic Constitution "*Conditae a Christo*" made no provision, since it was only concerned with religious Congregations. The Code of Canon Law also was deliberately silent about those Institutes. As the matter did not yet seem to be ripe, the Codex left all that was to be appointed for them to future legislation.

Having repeatedly considered these things in view of the duty that rests on Our conscience and in view of the paternal love which We bear to souls that are so generously devoting themselves to the pursuit of holiness in the world; having also before Us the desirability of a wise discrimination of the various Societies, and the desirability of recognizing as true Institutes those only which authentically profess a full life of perfection; wishing, moreover, to avert the danger of the unceasing erection of new Institutes—often imprudently and purposelessly founded—; wishing, furthermore, that those Institutes which deserve approval may obtain such a special juridical appointment as corresponds well and fully to their nature, purposes and circumstances, We have thought and decided to do the same for secular Institutes as Our Predecessor of immortal memory, Leo XIII did so prudently and wisely for Congregations of simple vows through the Apostolic Constitution "*Conditae a Christo*". Therefore, by these present letters We approve a general Statute of secular Institutes which has been diligently examined by the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office in what belongs to its competence, and has also been carefully drawn up and elaborated by the Sacred Congregation of Religious, at Our command and under Our guidance. All, then, that follows We declare, ordain, and constitute by Our Apostolic authority.

These things being enacted as aforesaid, We depute for the execution of all contained therein the Sacred Congregation of Religious, with all faculties necessary and opportune.

SPECIAL LAW  
of  
SECULAR INSTITUTES

ART. I

The name of Institutes, or Secular Institutes, properly belongs to Societies, clerical or lay, which, in view of acquiring Christian perfection and fully exercising their apostolate, profess the evangelical counsels in the world. By this name they are to be clearly distinguished from other common Associations of the faithful (Pars III, Lib. II, C.I.C.).

ART. II

§1. Secular Institutes, since they do not take the three public vows of religion (cc. 1308 § 1 and 488 § 1), and do not impose common life or community of dwelling under one roof on all their members, as the canons prescribe (cc. 487 ff. and 673 ff.), are:

1. In law, according to rule, not "Religions" in the proper sense, and cannot be called so (cc. 487 and 488, 1<sup>o</sup>). Neither are they Societies of common life (c. 673 § 1).

2. They are not bound by the proper and special law of "Religions" or Societies of common life; neither can they use that law, except in so far as some ordinance of the said law, particularly of that used by Societies without public vows, is legitimately adapted and applied to them, by way of exception.

§2. Institutes, with due regard to the common regulations of canon law which concern them, have a law of their own more closely corresponding to their special nature and condition, which law is embodied in the following ordinances:

1<sup>o</sup> They are governed by the general regulations of this Apostolic Constitution, which form, as it were, the special statute of all secular Institutes.

2<sup>o</sup> By the regulations which the Sacred Congregation of Religious issue, as necessity demands and experience suggests, either by way of interpretation of the Apostolic Constitution or by way of extension and applications—such regulations, namely, as the Congregation shall think fit to issue for all or for some of the said Institutes.

3<sup>o</sup> By special Constitutions in accordance with the Articles which follow (ART V-VIII). These shall be approved inasmuch as they prudently adapt the general regulations of law and the special regulations described above (nn. 1<sup>o</sup> and 2<sup>o</sup>) to the ends,



needs and circumstances of the various Institutes—these latter differing not a little from each other.

ART. III

§1. In order that some pious Association of the faithful may, in accordance with the Articles to follow, be qualified to obtain erection as a secular Institute, it must have the following requisites (§§ 2-4), besides the common requirements:

§2. With regard to consecration of life and the profession of Christian perfection.

Associates, who wish to be enrolled in Institutes as members in the strict sense, besides those exercises of piety and abnegation which are necessarily incumbent on all who aspire to the perfection of Christian life, must also efficaciously tend to that perfection in the special ways which are set down hereunder:

1<sup>o</sup> By profession of celibacy made before God and of perfect chastity, which profession should be confirmed by a vow, an oath, by a consecration obliging in conscience, according to the Constitutions.

2<sup>o</sup> By a vow or promise of obedience, so that, being bound by a permanent tie, they may dedicate themselves wholly to God and in all things be always morally under the hand and guidance of Superiors, according to the Constitutions.

3<sup>o</sup> By a vow or promise of poverty, in virtue of which they cannot have the free use of temporal goods, but a defined and limited use, according to the Constitutions.

§3. With regard to the incorporation of members into the special Institute and with regard to the bond arising therefrom.

The bond whereby a secular Institute and its members properly so called should be mutually joined, must be:

1<sup>o</sup> Stable—according to the Constitutions perpetual or temporary, the latter to be renewed when the time has elapsed (c. 488, 1<sup>o</sup>).

2<sup>o</sup> Mutual and full, so that, according to the Constitutions, the subject gives himself wholly to the Institute, and the Institute takes care and responsibility for the subject.

§3. With regard to the common centres and houses of secular Institutes.

Secular Institutes, although they do not impose common life and residence under the same roof on all their members, in the terms of the regulation of this law (ART. II, §1) must, nevertheless, according to

need and utility, have one or many common houses, in which:

1<sup>o</sup> Those may reside who exercise authority—especially supreme or regional—over the Institute.

2<sup>o</sup> Members may be able to reside or gather, in order to receive or supplement their training, to make spiritual exercises and such like.

3<sup>o</sup> Members can be received who on account of ill health, or other circumstances are not able to provide for themselves, or who (it being inexpedient) cannot reside privately by themselves or with others.

#### ART. IV

§1. Secular Institutes (ART. I) depend on the Sacred Congregations of Religious, with due regard to the rights of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, in accordance with can. 252 §3, in what concerns Societies and Seminaries destined for Missions.

§2. Associations which have not the character or do not fully profess the purpose described in ART. I, and those also which are devoid of some of the elements set down in Articles I and III of this Apostolic Constitution, are controlled by the law of Associations of the faithful, as in cc. 684 ff., and depend on the Sacred Congregation of the Council, with due regard to the ruling of can. 252 §3 concerning the territories of Missions.

#### ART. V

§1. Secular Institutes may be founded by Bishops, but not by Vicars Capitular or Vicars General. Bishops can erect such Institutes and found them as a moral person, according to can. 100, part 1 and 2.

§2. However, Bishops should not found such Institutes or allow them to be founded, without consulting the Sacred Congregation of Religious, in accordance with can. 492 §1 and the Article which follows.

#### ART. VI

§1. In order that the Sacred Congregation of Religious may grant permission to erect Institutes, as laid down in ART. V, when the said Bishops consult the Sacred Congregation in advance on the erection of the Institutes, the Congregation should be informed about such things as are defined by the same Sacred Congregation in the Regulations given by it (nn. 3-5) for the case of erection of Congregations or Societies of common life of diocesan legal standing. Here, naturally, points of general agreement should be taken (*congrua congruis referendo*) for reference to the Congregation's judgment. The information should also cover all other things which have been



introduced by the style and practice of the same Congregation or shall be introduced hereafter.

§2. When the permission of the Sacred Congregation of Religious has been obtained by Bishops, nothing shall stand in the way of their freely using their own right to make the foundation. But, when the foundation is made, let the Bishops not omit to send official notice of it to the Sacred Congregation.

#### ART. VII

§1. Secular Institutes, on obtaining approbation or a decree of praise from the Holy See, become Institutes of pontifical legal standing (cc. 488, 3<sup>o</sup>, 673, §2).

§2. In order that secular Institutes of diocesan legal standing may obtain a decree of praise or approbation, they are required to submit in general to the judgment of the Sacred Congregation of Religious similar information (*congrua congruis referendo*) as is prescribed and defined by the Regulations (nn. 6 ff.) and by the style and practice of the same Sacred Congregation in the case of Congregations and Societies of common life, or shall hereafter be defined.

§3. For the first and subsequent (should the case require it), and for the definitive approbation of the Constitutions of those Institutes the procedure is as follows:

1st The first discussion of the cause, prepared in the usual way and set forth by at least one Consultor, who gives an opinion and a discourse upon it, takes place in a Commission of Consultors under the guidance of his Excellency, the Secretary of the same Sacred Congregation, or of some one who takes his place.

2nd Thereafter, the whole matter is examined in plenary session under the presidency of his Eminence, the Cardinal Prefect of the Sacred Congregation. In this plenary session, convened for the purpose of giving a decision, experts, or the more expert Consultors are invited to debate the cause more thoroughly, as necessity or utility may suggest.

3rd The resolution of this plenary session shall in Audience be reported by his Eminence, the Cardinal Prefect, or by his Excellency the Secretary to His Holiness, and submitted to His supreme judgment.

#### ART. VIII

Secular Institutes, besides being subject to their own special laws, if such are made or shall be made hereafter, are, according to the law obtaining for non-exempt Congregations and Societies of common life, subject to the local Ordinaries.

## ART. IX

The internal government of secular Institutes can be arranged hierarchically like the government of "Religions" and Societies of common life, according to the nature, ends and circumstances of the Institutes, like being compared to like (*congrua congruis*) in referring things to the judgement of the Sacred Congregation.

## ART. X

Regarding the rights and obligations of Institutes already founded, and approved by Bishops (after consulting the Holy See) or by the Holy See itself, no change is made by this Apostolic Constitution.

These things We decree, declare and sanction, likewise deciding that this Apostolic Constitution has and shall always have force, validity and vigour, and that it obtains and secures its full and complete effects, everything to the contrary notwithstanding, even if worthy of most special mention. Let no man therefore dare to infringe this Constitution promulgated by Us, or with rash audacity act contrary to it.

Given at Rome, from St. Peter's, the 2nd day of February, sacred to the Purification of the B.V.M., in the year 1947, the 8th of Our Pontificate.

PIUS XII POPE.



# Christ & Canterbury—1

*Summary:* Christological extravagances of Dr. Barnes—Result of long crisis in English theology—Kenotic Theory—Abandonment of traditional doctrine—Reasons given for abandonment—Views of leading Protestant theologians—Dilemma of Anglicans—To deny Christ's divinity or to accept Nestorianism—Anglican attitude to Creeds—Demand for restatement of belief—Doctrinal peril of Anglican Church.

The press, recently, has given us sensational reports of the latest Christological extravagances of Dr. E. W. Barnes, the modernist bishop of Birmingham. In his recent work, *The Rise of Christianity*, the christian doctrines of Christ's Virgin-birth, His physical resurrection, and His miracles are relegated to the abyss of mythology and superstition. Anyone who had the slightest acquaintance with Dr. Barnes' opinions could not register surprise at his latest theological vagaries. He had already assured us that "extravagances of belief are produced by decay of faith"<sup>1</sup>; it seems that complete unbelief may come from the same unhappy source. If you were to ask Dr. Barnes: "Is Jesus Christ God?", he would turn from that momentous question with a heart as cold as ice. He would tell you that "the Christian Church has never made this unguarded statement"<sup>2</sup> that "Jesus was God"; he would have you believe that the Christian Church has never taught boldly that Jesus Christ is "*Deum verum de Deo vero, consubstantialem Patri*"! Dr. Barnes would have you to understand that Jesus was God in the sense that He had "the value of God" for us: that everything that could be revealed of God in man was revealed in Jesus Christ. The Bishop is prepared to extol the sublime character of the man Jesus with every possible eloquent epithet, and to exhort all Christians to base their lives on His, but if you ask him how Jesus Christ differs from all other men he will dogmatically teach you that "the answer is that He was unique in His unbroken consciousness of communion with God, and in His unswerving loyalty to the Divine Father".<sup>3</sup> In other words, He was the Son of God, in a moral sense, and the difference between Him and us is one of degree.

In the light of such teachings, therefore, the latest pronouncements of the modernist-riddled bishop quite fail to touch the chord of sur-

---

<sup>1</sup>*Should Such a Faith Offend?*, p. 298.

<sup>2</sup>*ibid.*, p. 152.

<sup>3</sup>*ibid.*, p. 154.

prise. As Chesterton wisely remarked: "It is easy to be a madman: it is easy to be a heretic. It is always easy to let the age have its head; the difficult thing is to keep one's own. It is always easy to be a modernist. To have fallen into any of those open traps of error and exaggeration which fashion after fashion and sect after sect set along the historic path of Christendom—that would indeed have been simple. It is always simple to fall; there are an infinity of angles at which one falls, only one at which one stands".

However, we are not particularly interested in Dr. Barnes' naturalism as such, but what does interest us—and what we hope to outline in this article—is the rather fascinating process of the last fifty years of Anglican theology, a process of decay of which Dr. Barnes' theories are the logical offspring. And we deem such a study not unprofitable for many obvious reasons.

\*

\*

\*

\*

"Whom do men say that I am?" This perennial question falling from the lips of Christ our Lord has, more than any other, exercised and tormented the minds of men in every Christian age: "What think ye of Christ?" Where those two in one flesh are not separated—Christ and His Church which is His pleroma—the answer has never changed. As much as can be understood by man in this life is given us to understand. But, out of the range of the infallible voice of Christ's Church many answers have been given in almost every century, and almost as many times has the dark night of schism and doubt settled on some part of the Christian world. This was particularly true of the East, where the great Christological heresies arose and fell in quick succession, especially in the fifth century, the golden age of Christological controversy. The question is being asked to-day, with much vigour and vital interest, and has produced many and startling answers. It is important to note, as we have discovered, that the Protestant theologians of England have for the last fifty years been passing through a tremendous Christological crisis, the most severe theological crisis that they have experienced since the original sin of Protestantism was committed—the separation of Christ and His Church.

It has been the age of invention in English Protestant theology. Until the opening of our century the divines witnessed but little theo-

logical speculation. The Kenotic theories<sup>4</sup> were the more prominent because they were the only exceptions. English theologians had been rather concerned with the more preliminary questions of the authenticity and historicity of texts; but the turning of our century witnessed the outbreak of speculation in the Anglican schools, and the period of independent enterprise began for the first time in their history. The universal tendency is epitomized in the attempt to *modernize* Christology, that is, to re-interpret the doctrine of the Person of Christ in modern terms and ideas. The extensive movement of the past fifty years has two aspects, one negative or destructive, which consists in the total rejection of the traditional expression of Catholic doctrine on the Incarnation; the second embraces a positive effort to reconstruct the "true Person of Christ". This article deals with the former.

---

<sup>4</sup>As a point of interest, the Kenotic theory, which was the only Christological system to receive anything like general acceptance in England, has to-day ceased to be professed openly and systematically as the probable explanation of the Incarnation.

The theory was so named from the words of St. Paul (*Phil. 2, 5-8*): "*cauton ekenosen*, He emptied Himself".

In its most popular form it claimed as its chief patron Bishop Gore, who remained faithful to it until death (1932), and had received the support of a large number of eager disciples among whom the more eminent were Ottley, Swayne, Moorhouse, Bright, Hawkesworth, Rashdall, D'Arcy, Forrest, Valentine, and Barnes.

Rejecting the theory of Absolute Metamorphosis, or Divine suicide (which originated with Gess and was supported by Dr. Newton Clarke), according to which the Logos so depotentiated Himself of all Divine attributes that He ceased from Divine consciousness during His earthly life and took the place of the human soul in Christ, Gore devised the following theory:

- 1) He postulated the existence of a double life from two non-communicating life-centres of the Logos during the humiliation of the Incarnation. As God, living in the bosom of the Father, He continued His Trinitarian function, and also His cosmic functions as Creator and Sustainer of the universe. As depotentiated Logos, united with creaturehood, He knew nothing whatsoever of these Trinitarian and cosmic functions, and only knew Himself to be God in such a sense as that knowledge is possible to the faculties of manhood!
- 2) He distinguished the divine attributes into absolute and relative. In the Incarnation the Logos, by self-limitation, divested Himself of the relative attributes of omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence, and thus lived a purely human life on earth. (cf. *Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation*, Diss. II).

From the very beginning of the movement many prominent divines uncompromisingly rejected the theory: e.g., Bishop Stubbs, Bishop Moul, Drs. Gifford, Bright, Powell, Dale, Orr, Richey, Caird and Bishop Weston. Having destroyed the scriptural, patristic and theological foundations of the theory, they showed that only one who had suffered a kenosis of his understanding could possibly support it. Yet, we must admit that it was a sincere effort to preserve some divine element in Christ. And so much can hardly be said of present-day Anglican Christologies.



# I. THE ABANDONMENT OF THE TRADITIONAL EXPRESSION OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE PERSON OF CHRIST:—

The opening of our century saw the English divines in conflict with the traditional Christological doctrine as expressed at Chalcedon;<sup>5</sup> a conflict which quickly developed into open hostility and has finally led to its determined rejection. Already the movement was deeply rooted in Germany. Professor Loofs informed the English Protestant world in his Oberlin lectures of 1911 that "there is hardly a single learned (Protestant) theologian—I know of none in Germany—who defends the orthodox Christology in its unaltered form".<sup>6</sup> The same was soon to be true of England. We consider this to be the most drastic and astounding step that has been taken by modern English theologians. It is not easy to reduce the many reasons for this revolt from the superabundant literature on the subject, but they may be chiefly confined to the following:

- a) The doctrine of the "two natures" is universally and unhesitatingly rejected, because it is said to signify an *irreducible dualism* in Christ which destroys the unity of His person.

"The Chalcedonian formula", laments Dr. J. Denny, "may once have seemed to help intelligence; at the very utmost now it can do no more than guard against error. . . . The formula of two natures in one person does not adequately reproduce the impression that he makes. The Divine and the human are not distinct, and the incomprehensible artificialities of the *communicatio idiomatum* cannot avail at once to maintain their distinctness and deny it".<sup>7</sup> This attitude of loosely placing the divine element in Christ side by side with the human is the charge brought against the Fathers at Chalcedon: "It is surprising how long and how completely the latin Church remained content with the formula of Leo as the Council accepted it. . . . so far from betraying any speculative need for the unifying of the Incarnate life, mediaeval divinity was satisfied to set the Godhead of our Lord alongside his humanity with the loosest conceivable relationship between them. God being thought of by the schoolmen in His metaphysical unchangeableness was too unlike the creature for any real union of the one with the other to be thinkable".<sup>8</sup> The scholastic doctrine of the human

<sup>5</sup>cf. Denzinger, n. 148, 143, 144.

<sup>6</sup>Lectures later published in his work: *What is the Truth about Jesus Christ?* (Edinburgh, 1913).

<sup>7</sup>*Studies in Theology*, p. 69-70.

<sup>8</sup>Dr. O. J. Dykes: *The Expository Times* (1905-6), p. 10.

nature as an "instrumentum coniunctum Verbi" is thrown aside by all as an artificial construction which leads to a docetic concept of Christ's human life.<sup>9</sup> "A being who combines in an inscrutable fashion divine with human properties, and of whom consequently *contradictory assertions* may be made, whose single person is divine, while his dual natures hold an undefined relation to one another: this is not a scheme to satisfy either head or heart. It is but the bare skeleton of a dogma in which one cannot readily recognize either the Jesus of the Gospels or the Christ of the Church's worship".<sup>10</sup>

Not only did the Fathers of Chalcedon fail to settle the question of the Incarnation, but their hopelessly inadequate and unintelligible definition became the root-cause of the many conflicts which later tore the Church and rushed her into opposite heresies.<sup>11</sup>

- b) A second reason for the Anglican divines' scornful rejection of the traditional doctrine of the "one person in two distinct natures" is that it gives us an artificial construction of Christ's person.

From this point of view trenchant attacks have been directed against the orthodox position. "Because it is laid down", complains Dr. Gore, "that there are to be recognized in Christ the two distinct natures, divine and human, what it is not unfair to call a *fancy picture* of Christ is drawn, as acting now in one nature, and now in another, now as God and now as man, which does not really correspond to the picture in the Gospels".<sup>12</sup> If such a theologian as Bishop Gore should have so erroneously conceived the theanthropic actions of the Incarnate Word one can easily understand how others of less genuine scholarship have erred along the same path. Dr. T. H. Bindley, for example, proclaims that "Leo said that the two natures acted alternately. The lowliness of the manhood and the loftiness of the Godhead '*sunt invicem*', that is, are by turns alternate in activity".<sup>13</sup> Leo, of course, said no such thing; nothing was further from his thoughts, as is quite evident to any Catholic theologian. All the Anglican divines are completely in agreement that the chief characteristic of the orthodox doctrine is its "frigid artificiality" which leads to the positing of two hypostases in Christ and thus ends in Nestorianism which the Church,

<sup>9</sup>Dr. W. Moberly: *Atonement and Personality*, p. 96.

<sup>10</sup>O. J. Dykes, *l.c.*, p. 10.

<sup>11</sup>cf. Alexander Bruce: *The Humiliation of Christ*, p. 65-66.

<sup>12</sup>*Belief in Christ*, p. 223.

<sup>13</sup>*The Expositor*, Oct., 1923, p. 313.

ironically, had hoped to condemn.<sup>14</sup> Dr. Garvie clearly manifests the general misunderstanding, or rather ignorance, of true Patristic thought when he writes: "Whenever we sum up the orthodox Christology in the phrase 'two natures in one person', we do not mean exactly what the Fathers intended. They meant a *Divine Subject* and a *human subject distinct* the one from the other".<sup>15</sup> To us it is absurd to think that the Fathers professed in reality what they actually condemned, yet Dr. Garvie is quite emphatic on the matter, while at the same time professing the heresy of theopaschism: "While the man in Christ suffered, it is, according to the Council, monstrous to believe that the God in Him suffered with the man. One *subject* in Christ thus suffered, and the other did not and could not. How can we conceive any personal union here?"<sup>16</sup> The creed of Chalcedon, therefore, was only "an enforced truce, for it is through and through a theological compromise".

Now, it is outside the scope of this article to give a refutation of these ridiculous Anglican assertions. It truly startles one to find such lamentably false interpretations of the Church's teaching. They are in the unhappy position of having rejected what they do not understand. Now we pass on to the third reason for renouncing the orthodox doctrine:

- c) The doctrine of the "Two Natures" must be considered definitely *unscriptural*.

"The 'Two Natures' doctrine of the person of Christ, in its traditional form, is not scriptural, and ought to be given up. . . . To separate the God from the man in Christ, and say this he did as God, and that as man, is to do violence, not only to Christ, but to our own thinking".<sup>17</sup> Dr. Farley has the wholehearted support of all his colleagues in this point of view,<sup>18</sup> but once more it is clear to anyone who has done even an elementary course in theology that the interpretation of the Anglican divines does violence to the ever-constant doctrine of the Church regarding the theandric actions of the Word Incarnate and to the Patristic and scholastic doctrine of the "*communicatio idiomatum*".

<sup>14</sup>cf. J. S. MacArthur: "A Plea for the Chalcedonian Christology", *Church Quarterly Review*, July, 1925, p. 249; also Professor Henry Jones: Art. "Jesus or Christ?", *Hib. Supplement*, 1909, p. 90; also T. B. Kilpatrick, "Character of Christ", *Hasting's Dict. of the Bible*, Vol. 1, p. 281.

<sup>15</sup>A. E. Garvie, *The Expos. Times*, Vol. 23, p. 506.

<sup>16</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 506.

<sup>17</sup>W. J. Farley, *Exp. Times*, Vol. 34 (1922), pp. 85 ff.

<sup>18</sup>cf. B. F. Westcott, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 18, p. 67; C. Gore, *Belief in Christ*, pp. 223 ff.; and *Dissertations*, II.



We shall now outline the last, and perhaps the most insistent and cogent reason for the new destructive attitude of the modern Anglican theologians on this question.

- d) The doctrine of the "Two Natures" does not do full justice to the *humanity* of Christ.

When dealing with this aspect of the forsaken Chalcedonian formula the divines become really eloquent in their condemnation, accusing the Fathers of the Church of having reduced Christ's humanity to "a lifeless thing". "The anatomical process to which the human nature was subjected left it an inanimate carcase with the form and features of a man, but without the inspiring soul. Already what Dorner happily called the transubstantiating process had begun, which was to evacuate Christ's humanity of all its contents, and leave only the outward shell with a God within".<sup>19</sup> Here we have touched the very heart of the new Anglican theology of our century. Their main preoccupation has been to dwell, almost exclusively, on Christ's *humanity*. Nothing which, in their sight, tends to minimize His humanity in the slightest way will for a moment be tolerated in any of their schools of thought,—a tendency which has led not only to the overthrow of the traditional doctrine, but to the many "humanitarian" exaggerations and heresies of which we shall speak later. Consequently, the Church's teaching of a complete but *impersonal* human nature is universally derided as being inconsistent with His historical life on earth, with "the development and discipline of His moral character, His real growth from ignorance to wisdom and the real progress of His religious consciousness".<sup>20</sup> We are told, then, that "we must absolutely jettison the traditional doctrine that His personality was not human but divine. . . . Such a statement is a denial of the Incarnation. There is for us no such thing as a human nature apart from human personality".<sup>21</sup>

In passing we may point out that this outburst from Dr. Bethune-Baker is quite comprehensible from the modernistic spirit, the Anglican divines have embraced the patently erroneous modernistic definition of personality as "consciousness of self". The Church has always taught that Christ possesses a human and a divine consciousness, as a necessary consecratory of the two complete, integral natures, but she rejects the modernists' teaching concerning the essential constituent of

<sup>19</sup>Prof. Alexander Bruce, *The Humiliation of Christ*, pp. 69-70.

<sup>20</sup>cf. A. E. Garvie, *Studies on the Inner Life of Jesus*, p. 81.

<sup>21</sup>Dr. T. J. Bethune-Baker: "Cambridge Conference," 1921; cf. *Expos. T.*, Vol. 33, p. 487.

personality (consciousness of self). The Anglicans, as a result of their connubial relationship with modernism, are faced with this unhappy dilemma: They must admit either that the personality of Christ was a purely human personality, and then Christ was purely man and not God—which is the end of the Incarnation—or, they must conclude that in Christ there were two distinct persons, human and divine, — which is the most vulgar form of the Nestorian heresy of a merely accidental union; for it is absolutely impossible that two complete persons should be united in a substantial, physical union, which a real Incarnation demands.

The paranymphs of this unfortunate espousal with modernism are legion: Dr. T. H. Bindley,<sup>22</sup> Dr. Moberly,<sup>23</sup> Dr. L. Hodgson,<sup>24</sup> Dr. Westcott,<sup>25</sup> Dr. W. Fulton,<sup>26</sup> Dr. H. A. Mackintosh,<sup>27</sup> Dr. J. S. MacArthur,<sup>28</sup> Dr. W. Fulton,<sup>29</sup>—all men who have exercised great influence on Anglican Theology during the greater part of our century—unanimously hold that the orthodox Christology well nigh destroyed the humanity of Christ, and proclaim that “there was in Him no impersonal humanity, which is impossible”.

Now, with the whole insistence placed on the humanity of Christ, it was not difficult to see in which direction Anglican theology would swing. Soon the very *possibility* of two natures existing in one person began to be questioned, and startling responses resulted: Professor L. W. Walker informed the theological world that two natures in the one person of Christ “is more than a mystery: it is an impossible conception, if the real manhood of Christ is to be held intact”.<sup>30</sup> This was the signal for which many had been secretly waiting, and it was greeted with warm approval by many who now openly stated that “it is not possible to believe that He was both ‘God’ and ‘man’. If we think we believe this we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us”. (Dr. J. C. Graham, “Fast and Loose in Theology”, *Hibbert Journal*, vol. 37, p. 53.)

It is abundantly clear that the only alternative of the two natures

<sup>22</sup>“The Chalcedonian Christology”, *The Expositor*, Oct., 1923, p. 315. ,

<sup>23</sup>*Atonement and Personality*, p. 94.

<sup>24</sup>“The Metaphysic of Nestorius”, in *Journal of Theol. Studies*, Oct., 1917, pp. 46-55.

<sup>25</sup>*Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 428.

<sup>26</sup>*The Expositor*, March, 1924, pp. 164-176.

<sup>27</sup>*The Person of Jesus Christ*, pp. 213 ff.

<sup>28</sup>“A Plea for the Chalcedonian Christology”, *Church Quarterly Review*, July, 1925, pp. 249-50.

<sup>29</sup>“The Person of Christ”, *Expositor*, March, 1924, p. 174.

<sup>30</sup>*cf. Hib. Journal*, Vol. 12, pp. 498-499.

is, of course, one nature: and that nature must be either human or Divine. Since, however, the Anglican Divines place all the insistence on the humanity of Christ, it soon became evident that, for them, the relation between Christ and God must remain a purely *ethical*, moral relation, and Christ will remain purely man.

Thus was sounded the funeral-note of the Council of Chalcedon and Orthodox Christology. And that is how men like Dr. Barnes were born.

\*

\*

\*

\*

## 2. THE ANGLICAN ATTITUDE TO THE CREEDS.

The work of destruction was not yet complete. The question naturally arises: What, then, is precisely the attitude of the Anglican divines to all the Christian Creeds as formulated in the early councils of the Church? We shall deal with this matter more summarily and, for the sake of clarity and order, we shall divide the matter into two sections, treating first of the pronouncements of the theologians, and secondly with the latest authoritative statement—the *Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Christian Doctrine*, published in 1938.

a) The pronouncements of the theologians take the form of a universal cry for a complete restatement of the doctrines of the church in a phraseology that will be in keeping with the progress of modern thought and science. This demand is quite logical in a system completely shot through with modernism. "If we are to find a creed", writes Dr. Garvie,<sup>31</sup> that will be something more than a divisive formula, we must first define our attitude to the Old Creeds. . . . It is clear that their absorption in abstruse metaphysics disqualifies them as working creeds for us who can love to call ourselves 'the modern man'. It is indeed something of a puzzle to us that Christian thinkers for centuries imagined that the kind of discussion that went on in the schools—on the person of Christ, for example—had some vital relation to the Christian religion, and that some even made man's immortal salvation depend on the acceptance of the right formula. From the standpoint of Christian faith the creeds are *profoundly disappointing* as regards both what is included and what is excluded. . . . The old categories of 'substance' and 'subsistence', 'nature' and 'person' have had their day; or rather we have to revise our conception of personality".

For Bishop Temple the Christian Creeds were nothing more or less than "a confession of the bankruptcy of Greek Patristic theology".<sup>32</sup> We may reply that the Greek Fathers were quite solvent

<sup>31</sup>*The Christian Doctrine of the Godhead*, p. 88.

<sup>32</sup>*Foundations*, p. 230.



as regards the metaphysical currency of their period, and if Anglican divines such as Bishop Temple have not proved capable of fathoming the depths of "Greek philosophical terminology" that is no reason for imputing a like ignorance to the giants of Christian thought who gave all their intellectual forces to defend what the Bishop and his colleagues would so lightly abandon. Yet he is fully supported in his policy of scornful rejection by a large army of theologians<sup>33</sup> whose voices sound emphatic, amidst the general uproar, demanding the abolition of the terminology of the creeds, "which belongs to a precritical stage of theology", and a re-expression of doctrine in keeping with the "fresh developments of the intellectual, moral, and social life of man". They are inexorable in their determination to search for new paths; not for them "are the hindrances, nor yet the helps, found in these ancient trammels by Christians who accept them as eternal truth".<sup>34</sup>

When we enter more deeply into this question, however, we find that the above exposition of the modern attitude to the traditional symbols of the Faith is only a half-truth; and, moreover, only the brighter half of the truth, however disturbing it may appear to Catholic theologians. We must truthfully say, as the result of objective study, that it is not merely a question of terminology that has generated this universal dissatisfaction: it is a question of more vital issue, namely, that the Anglican divines in general question the very *Doctrines* expressed in the Church's definitions and have taken refuge in a *Symbolical* or *Allegorical* interpretation of many of the tenets of faith. They have thus placed themselves outside the pale of traditional christianity, than which there can be no other. It would be tedious to give further lengthy quotations: all are agreed that the Creeds contain several "incredible statements", and ministers when reciting such allegorical expressions as: "*Natus ex Maria Virgine, descendit ad inferos, resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit in coelum*", and such like, must be allowed to make such *Mental Restrictions* as will be in keeping with their own intellectual convictions! Then comes chaos.

b) *The Archbishops' Commission on Christian Doctrine* sat for

---

<sup>33</sup>e.g. Dr. A. McGiffert: *A History of Christian Thought*, p. 193; Canon Storr: *Liberal Evangelicalism*, p. 120; Dr. A. Emmet: *The Expositor*, Vol. 26, n. 318; Bishop C. Gore: *Dissertations*, p. 212 ff; M. McAra: *Journal of Theol. Studies*, Jan., 1926, p. 185; Dr. B. H. Streeter: "The Suffering God", *Hib. Journal*, Vol. 12, pp. 604 ff; etc., etc.

<sup>34</sup>Professor R. Mackintosh: *Expos. Times*, Vol. 37, p. 202; cf. also Dr. Sydney Cave: "The Doctrine of the Person of Christ", *Exp. Times*, Vol. 37, pp. 247 ff; C. J. Wright: *The Meaning and Message of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 116 ff; Dr. Du Bose: *The Ecumenical Councils*, p. 256.

no less than sixteen years (1922-38). The *Report* was awaited with anxiety as the most important document since the publication of the *Thirty Nine Articles* of Anglican belief. When it appeared it read like the work of a confirmed modernist. It pandered to all the excesses of the divines; it turned the Christian "*Credo*" into an universal "*Dubito*". Here are some pertinent extracts:

- 1) "We wish to assert that the Church is in no way bound to the metaphysic or the psychology which lie behind the terms employed by the council" (Chalcedon).<sup>35</sup> "No such formulations are to be regarded as being, in principle, irreformable". (*Report*, p. 80.)
- 2) "Statements affirming particular facts may be found to have value as *pictorial expressions* of spiritual truths, even though the supposed facts themselves did not actually happen.... It is not therefore of necessity illegitimate to accept and affirm particular clauses of the creeds while understanding them in this symbolic sense". (*Report*, p. 37-38). The traditional 'phrases', however, are to be retained because they "lay less stringent fetters upon the free play of thought". (P. 50.)

To call all this 'prudential' would be an abuse of language: the only candid term for it is hypocrisy! However, such hypocrisy is formally countenanced by the Archbishops:

- 3) "Assent to formularies and the use of liturgical language in public worship should be understood as signifying such general acceptance without implying detailed assent to every phrase or proposition thus employed" (Clause 3 on Assent). Moreover, "a member of the Church should not be held to be involved in dishonesty merely on the ground that, in spite of some divergence from the tradition of the Church, he has assented (verbally) to formularies". (Clause 4.)

In the light of such authoritative statements we must not be surprised when we read these words from the pen of such an influential theologian as Dr. Bethune-Baker: "What is the ultimate significance of all our controversies? What real difference does it make to us what theory we hold of the person of Jesus Christ?"<sup>36</sup>

An interesting question arises: Why did not the Archbishops revise and restate the Creeds? The answer is easily forthcoming: such a

<sup>35</sup>*Report*, p. 81.

<sup>36</sup>*Nestorius and His Teaching*, p. 201, where he attempts to prove that Nestorius was not a "Nestorian"! But what real difference does it make whether Nestorius, or anyone else, was or was not a Nestorian?

revision would necessarily lead to a revision of the *39 Articles*; and such a revision the Anglican Church could not stand; it would disrupt the Church. Yet they seem to have missed the alternative, namely, that the secession of the intelligentsia can have only one result: there will soon be no church to disrupt.

Now you can understand how Dr. Barnes can do three seemingly incompatible things: recite the creeds—with a naive smile on his lips; write a 'theological' work denying the physical resurrection of Christ, His miracles, and His Virgin-birth (or anything else you like); and still sit comfortably on the episcopal chair of Birmingham.

What we have written is a brief outline of the *negative* aspect of the Anglican theological movement in our century. There is yet the *positive* aspect to be discussed. Having hurled the traditional Christology back into the centuries, they went their way in search of "the true historical Jesus", in a great movement called "Back to Christ". They carried with them two principal aims: first, to find that unity in the person of Christ which they maintain, the early Church failed to discover; secondly, to reinstate the *human* Christ whose figure the traditional Christology has obliterated. As to what they found we shall treat of in a future article.

As we close this portion of our work there passes before us the long procession of the giants of the Faith, the Fathers and martyrs of Christ's Church, who lived and laboured and died to preserve unsullied the divine deposit: in those days the blood of martyrs flowed in defence of one syllable! And they deemed it not too dear a price to pay in order that that syllable might guard our hopes. The inheritance is ours: it is our glory, our pride, our life.

(To be continued.)

T. MULDOON.



# Lyndhurst and Benedictine Education

## IV.

The Benedictines failed to establish themselves and with that failure Lyndhurst was lost. Dr. Polding, in his letters to Abbot Gregory, puts the blame on the lack of competent superiors, and felt that the return of Abbot Gregory would have mended all. The anti-Benedictine feeling stirred by mischievous letters to the press on the arrival of Dr. Vaughan indicated the strength of the prejudice in some quarters. It is certain that even greater hostility and disruption would have resulted had the much maligned and possibly misunderstood Abbot Gregory returned. Despite Dr. Gregory's ability and great personal courage in adversity, he seems to have been a bad choice for the colonial conditions and that seems the explanation of failure in so far as superiors are concerned. Lyndhurst Presidents were generally scholarly and individually fine, but they lacked the indefinable quality necessary to win the people's hearts for their community, and sought, perhaps, to build a little too quickly. Unfortunately, too, N.S.W. conditions never allowed the Benedictine life to be lived to its fullest. The monks were so few that their work of education must have occupied too great a proportion of their time. Dom Butler in his great work *Benedictine Monachism* has shown that a monastic school must have a large staff, so that the monks can be free to follow the community life in full. This was realised by Dr. Davis, who felt that a school of thirty-five boys needed at least ten teachers. Lyndhurst, lacking rich endowments and a large community, never attained such a happy position. The Superiors, able men, were harassed by financial insecurity; they were overworked; both they and their monks suffered spiritually from the consequent absence from monastic duties. Father Sheridan took refuge in debt; Prior Dwyer became broken in health; Dr. Norbert Quirk, after the promise of his early years as President, became a pathetic figure, who in reply to the affectionate greeting of the Ex-Students' Address on his return from Europe in 1875 could merely declare that 'whatever his faults...he had always tried to do his duty' and that, 'he had always tried to be strictly just'.

Within the community a certain degree of spiritual dryness may have been the result of overwork. Amongst the people anti-Benedictine prejudice was responsible, in Dr. Polding's opinion, for the absence of postulants necessary for the health of the community and the progress of the school. Unhappily, certain irregularities in community life provided the grounds on which these prejudices could be rationalised

and be used to feed the growing discontent with what the secular clergy, now in the majority, was pleased to see as 'Benedictine domination'. Many sought to strike at this domination by attacking Lyndhurst.

The College also became involved in the bitterness of English-Irish antagonism. Because of certain customs relating to the flying of the Union Jack and to prayers for the Queen, the Benedictines, the majority of whom were of Irish extraction, were identified as Englishmen, and not even the presence of Prior Dwyer, the grandson of Michael Dwyer, the great Wicklow chieftain, could destroy the illusion. To us, it seems unreasonable to expect any other than the Union Jack to be flown in a British colony, but one has only to read the letters signed *A Celt* and *A Milesian*, published in the *Sydney Morning Herald* and the *Freeman's Journal* in December, 1856, to gauge the strength of the prejudice amongst those who believed that the Benedictines indulged in 'hatred of everything Irish' and were perverting Irishmen since *A Celt* wrote, 'The state of the case was even worse than I could have imagined. Not only was that flag raised over the cross, but an Irish priest helped with his own hands to place it there'.

In 1860, the *Freeman's Journal* had sought to destroy this prejudice. At the same time Dr. Polding circularised the clergy and asked that the causes of dissatisfaction with Lyndhurst be stated. The results of the survey were not published, but from the press it is obvious that the alleged causes of dissatisfaction were chiefly the cost of Lyndhurst education, its classical nature, and the belief that as an ecclesiastical seminary it was not the best training ground for worldly avocations.

The modification of the curriculum in answer to this criticism has already been sufficiently stressed. The arguments as to Lyndhurst being essentially an ecclesiastical seminary are scarcely worthy of answer. Its record was lay and professional rather than ecclesiastical. An analysis of the enrolment for 1863—the only year for which an analysis was published—shows only four ecclesiastical students and sixty-three lay students.

The charge of Lyndhurst being expensive was quite frequently a cloak for those who preferred the more centrally situated, well endowed Sydney Grammar School, or for those who allowed racial prejudice to blind their judgment. By comparison with contemporary schools Lyndhurst was not expensive. The King's School, the City College and several other private schools all required the sixty guineas asked as fees by Lyndhurst for boarders. The editor of the *Freeman's*

*Journal*, January, 1861, censured those who had raised the issue of heavy fees. It is clear that some had complained because the tailor's bill had been added to the quarterly account. The pettiness of many of the complaints specified by the *Freeman's Journal* proves that fees were not the real stumbling block. There were many who could afford the fees and yet did not support the school. Dissatisfaction was also expressed at the number of extras, eight guineas for washing, two guineas for Drill and Music, Drawing and Dancing fees as arranged. Because of the criticism Lyndhurst reduced its fees in 1865, by abolishing extras and allowing a discount of 10% for brothers. In addition, of course, parents had to provide books, stationery, clothing, cutlery and also a bedstead, palliasse, hair mattress and bedding, or pay three pounds in lieu thereof.

These costs were not the stumbling block. For numbers of wealthy colonists, especially in south-western N.S.W., sent their sons to be educated abroad. There were the instances of Dr. Birmingham and his twelve Apostles, of O'Keefe of Morpeth leaving for Douai. There was also the loss to N.S.W. of the Murrays, Hubert and Gilbert. This tendency was condemned by Dr. Polding and the press, since it was detrimental to the growth of local educational establishments. It is easy to understand the point of view of some parents who often acted in good faith. Yet frequently one suspects that they were urged to send their children abroad by the clergy in order to undermine the Benedictine foundation in N.S.W.

While some would not avail themselves of Lyndhurst, there were others who could not afford to do so. For these at first no provision was made. By 1865, however, there was a growing feeling among some of the clergy and laity that a system of scholarships would benefit society, the individual scholarship holders and Lyndhurst. At their retreat in 1866, the Clergy of the Archdiocese decided to support scholarships, the funds to be raised by a series of lectures. The first scholarship exam was held on 14th June, 1866. Candidates were examined in grammar to prosody, spelling, dictation, reading, writing, composition, geography, especially that of Australia, Sacred History to the birth of Christ, the history of England and Ireland, arithmetic, algebra (elementary rules), geometry—Euclid Books I and II, Latin grammar and Christian Doctrine. The scholarships were won by W. Edmunds and H. O'Toole—Edmunds, aged ten, being placed at the head of the list.

This support was but short-lived. By 1869 the lads found them-



selves unendowed, and only the kindness of Dr. Quirk allowed further study.

In 1866 also the people of Albury subscribed seventy pounds to provide a scholarship. This was won by a boy named Joyce. How long this endowment lasted I could not ascertain. But neither the clerical scholarship nor the Albury scholarship had any effect on the College financial stability. What was required were not annual subscriptions in the form of scholarships, but an adequate capital endowment. This was not forthcoming.

By 1877, therefore, the lack of support for Lyndhurst, its financial insecurity and the competition of regional schools and seminaries, were factors which caused Dr. Vaughan to question the advisability of maintaining a school which produced brilliant students and fine Catholic laymen, but which could not support itself. By this time an additional factor was added. The Colonial Sugar Refining works had been built, and the locality was becoming unsuitable for a boarding school.

These factors, whether considered singly or collectively, were not insuperable obstacles, especially as Dr. Vaughan was a most able administrator. The community life of the monks could have been made satisfactory, one would think, without resort to the drastic measures, which entailed not only the loss of Lyndhurst, but also the suppression of the community itself. However, without going into this unhappy affair, it is only right to say the decision lay with Dr. Vaughan, himself a Benedictine.

The press of the day gives no indication as to the actual date of closing, but evidently Archbishop Vaughan made the decision to close the school at the end of the first term of 1877. The mid-winter examinations were held. It seems, from the absence of any further reports concerning the school, that 21st of June was the date of closing. No public notices were made, nor was there any press comment before or after the dissolution. There had, however, been a slight stir in the press when, on May 7th, the *Evening News* reported that the teachers had been given notice to leave. The following day, Father Dwyer denied this. Two days later, over the signature of *Scrutator*, there was published the following letter:—

Sir,

Your announcement of the intended reform of Lyndhurst is in the main so accurate that in what are regarded as well-informed circles the letter of the new President has caused unusual astonishment. On authority that cannot be questioned it has been stated

the majority, if not the whole, of the lay professors have received notice to leave and that the Rev. M. J. Dwyer's place is to be filled by another. These statements are facts. What you have published is substantially true and no amount of quibbling can mend the matter.<sup>1</sup>

This second attack was left unanswered. It seems, however, that some move had been made in early May, but of what nature it is difficult to say. The absence of comment by the *Freeman's Journal* can only lead to the inference of an active campaign to suppress the details, for always before the paper had been most active to defend Lyndhurst whenever the occasion arose. Yet when the school closed no comment was made. Only in the summary of the year 1877 appeared the single, terse statement, 'Lyndhurst is lost to us'.

It cannot be learnt with certainty when the property was subdivided and sold. *Old Chum*, a not wholly reliable correspondent to a Sydney newspaper in 1925, declared that the estate was surveyed and sold when St. Patrick's College, Manly, was being built, the mansion then being used as a private hospital for women. Later the property was subdivided by Mr. Morris Asher into three houses, part of which still stands.<sup>2</sup> The sale realised £30,000, of which £6000 was given to the Jesuits to help in the foundation of Riverview. The rest was applied to Manly College in which the Lyndhurst Library was ultimately housed, after its transfer from St. John's College within the University.

The loss of Lyndhurst was a blow to the Church in N.S.W., which needed and, perhaps, still needs the monks of St. Benedict to provide scholarly Catholics, steeped in the true Catholic spirit, to combat social and political evils.

St. Mary's College, Lyndhurst, had been a noble experiment which could surely have been made to succeed if Dr. Vaughan had seen fit to apply his administrative genius to the solution of the problems affecting the school as such, and had he made more allowance for the difficult, colonial, missionary conditions in which the monks were striving, burdened by heavy educational tasks, to follow the Holy Rule of St. Benedict.

M. FORSTER.

(The End).

---

<sup>1</sup>*Evening News*, 9/5/'77.

<sup>2</sup>*Newspaper Cuttings*, Vol. 159, Mitchell Library.

# Nature of Divine Vocation to the Priesthood

*Summary:* Ambiguity of word 'Vocation'—Views of theologians—Roman decision on Lahitton's book—Meaning of decision—What does 'vocation' mean?—Lahitton's proposal: vocation is the call of the bishop—Value of the proposal—Other definitions—Divine Vocation and Canonical Vocation—Some arguments in favour of older theory.

The words of Holy Scripture, the express teaching of the Church and the unanimous consent of Tradition demonstrate not only the fact but also the absolute necessity of a divine vocation to the priesthood. Without shadow of doubt or trace of hesitancy we are taught that it is God's business to hire labourers for His vineyard and to place shepherds over His flock. Man's part is but to pray the Lord of the harvest to send reapers into the field; and if, by divine providence, he himself be chosen to dispense the mysteries of God then he should gladly follow the call of his Master.

If God wants a certain young man to become a priest then He must reveal His purpose. When and in what manner is that done? Almighty God could make known His intention early in life or late or at one fixed hour, say the moment of ordination: He could do it internally and directly by personal revelation or He could manifest His divine will by endowing the person of His choice with certain gifts of grace and qualities of mind and will and body: He could do it externally and indirectly by outside agents; as of old when He used Ananias to teach Saul of Tarsus and Andrew to summon Simon, so to-day He could invite a young man through his parents, his teachers, his confessors, or the Bishops of the Church that He has founded. God could use all these ways and He could dispense with any one of them; He could use a different way each time or the same way every time; but some way He must use. We know, however, that in the supernatural as well as in the natural order God usually acts in a fashion that is gradual, orderly, constant. He does not act *ex abrupto*. Therefore, it can be reasonably expected that in this matter of priestly vocation also, the call from God will be made known, not suddenly, but in some gradual, orderly, constant manner. Whatever it be, that way goes by the name of vocation to the priesthood.

## *Ambiguity of the word Vocation.*

The word vocation, sacerdotal vocation, is used by the Church to designate two things. It is applied to the official summons of the



bishop when he calls a candidate to receive the power of offering sacrifice and of forgiving sins. This is the meaning of the phrase of the Tridentine Catechism—*vocari autem a Deo qui a legitimis ministris vocantur*;<sup>1</sup> it is used in the same sense in the catechism of Pius X stating that no one may enter the ranks of the priesthood unless possessed of a vocation from God, that is unless called by the bishop.<sup>2</sup> But sacerdotal vocation has another meaning also. It is applied to some definite quality or condition which must be found in a young man before he is summoned to the rite of ordination. The word is used in this manner in several recent instructions of the Holy See<sup>3</sup> as well as in Papal Encyclicals.<sup>4</sup>

This twofold usage and this double meaning of the one word, vocation, can easily lead to ambiguity and equivocation; in point of fact it has caused considerable confusion of thought. Vocation has become a much abused word. The only way to avoid confusion is first to clearly understand what is meant by vocation and then to find some mode of speech which will express, without equivocation, that meaning.

There is not much difficulty in arriving at a correct estimate of vocation as applied to the episcopal summons. All are agreed at least in this that it is the formal admission to the priesthood made by the Church, through her bishops, the lawful ministers of the Sacrament of Holy Orders. But the meaning of vocation when used of a young man in a seminary or of a boy not yet advanced even that far towards the sanctuary is not so clear. We speak of boys as having a vocation or endowed with a vocation.<sup>5</sup> Is there any meaning in the phrase or is it just a pious exaggeration? What is this vocation and how do we recognise it in individual cases?

The purpose of this paper is, first, to offer a satisfactory answer to the question: just what is meant when it is said that a boy has a voca-

<sup>1</sup>III chap. 7, q. 3.

<sup>2</sup>"Nessuno può entrare a suo arbitrio negli Ordini, ma deve essere chiamato da Dio per mezzo del proprio vescovo, cioè deve avere la vocazione, con le virtù e, con le attitudini al sacro ministero, da essa richieste". Part III, sec. 1, chap. VIII, n. 403.

<sup>3</sup>Instruction of the Sacred Congregation for the discipline of the Sacraments, 20 Dec., 1930, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 1931, page 120. Instruction of the Sacred Congregation for Religious, 1 Dec., 1931, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 1932, page 74-81—vide 'Divine Vocation to the Priesthood,' in *Aust. Cath. Record*, January, 1946.

<sup>4</sup>vg. *Ad Catholicos Sacerdotii Fastigium*, 20 December, 1935, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 1936, page 5-53.

<sup>5</sup>This very phrase 'a youth endowed with a priestly vocation' is found in a letter of their Lordships of the Province of Brisbane, March, 1941. Something similar is had in a letter of the Bishops of the Adelaide Province, July, 1941.

tion?; secondly, to indicate what terminology is best suited to dissipate that confusion of thought mentioned above; and, thirdly, to show, more by suggestion than by definitive argument, how one may arrive at an adequate definition of sacerdotal vocation.

*What is meant when it is said that a boy or young man has a vocation?*

The answer to this question can be found either in the writings of Theologians or in some authoritative pronouncement of the Holy See.<sup>6</sup>

a) *Meaning of vocation as given by Theologians.*

Theologians are seemingly in disagreement as to the nature and elements of vocation generally; hence it is not an easy task to find a commonly accepted definition of the word when used of a youth or a young man. A brilliant theologian like Canon Joseph Lahitton could describe it in one book<sup>7</sup> as the communication of God's eternal decree to the candidate and yet in less than two years he said it was nothing more than the call of the bishop, and that this was the only vocation properly so called.<sup>8</sup> Many,<sup>9</sup> Schneider,<sup>10</sup> Wernz,<sup>11</sup> Mulders,<sup>12</sup> and many others hold that it is a special providence on the part of God willing a certain man to become a priest and endowing him with the qualities necessary for this sacred calling. There were some who wrote that every vocation is a desire, compelling and imperious, of the candidate; and these, we know, erred.<sup>13</sup> There are still a few who say that the vocation of a boy is a desire, a yearning for the priesthood; and, we think, these also err.<sup>14</sup> Some, following Lahitton's second definition and, to a certain extent, misunderstanding his attempted change of

<sup>6</sup>We do not propose to study the matter here in the light of Sacred Scripture.

<sup>7</sup>*La Vocation Sacerdotale*, 1909: "La vocation divine...est l'élection et l'appel à l'état ecclésiastique...que Dieu fait de toute éternité et qu'il manifeste dans le temps par l'organe des ministres de l'Eglise".

<sup>8</sup>Deux conceptions divergentes de la vocation sacerdotale, 1910: "La vocation divine...est la promotion d'un sujet au sacerdoce par les ministres de l'Eglise agissant au nom de Dieu", page 22. The quotations in note 7, 8 are from the second edition of *Le Vocation Sacerdotale*, pages 85-87.

<sup>9</sup>*De Sacra Ordinatione*, page 79: "Vocatio divina est actus providentiae supernaturalis, quo Deus aliquem ad statum clericalem destinat ipsique media preparat ad finem assequendum necessaria".

<sup>10</sup>*Manuale Clericorum*, page 39: "Nomine vocationis ad statum clericalem intelligitur dispositio divinae providentiae, qua Deus pro suo beneplacito quosdam homines seligit atque segregat ad opus sui ministerii ipsisque qualitates et gratias ad id necessarias elargitur".

<sup>11</sup>Wernz-Vidal, *Jus Canonicum*, vol. IV, n. 126.

<sup>12</sup>*La Vocation au Sacerdoce*, passim.

<sup>13</sup>Decree of Pius X, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 1912, page 485.

<sup>14</sup>Of late years several small pamphlets describe vocation as a desire or yearning; this is not even a half truth and it leads to error even if in itself it is not erroneous.

terminology, maintain that God's call is identical with that of the bishop and consequently one cannot correctly speak of a boy as endowed with a vocation. Finally there are a number who teach that when we say that a boy has a vocation we mean no more than that he has the sum total of those qualities necessary to carry out the duties of the sacred ministry.<sup>15</sup>

In the light of this great divergency of opinion it seems too big a task to here discover the true meaning of the word vocation as used by these Theologians.<sup>16</sup> Moreover, it is quite beyond us to examine the matter in the sources of Tradition for the simple reason that these are not sufficiently at our disposal.<sup>17</sup> Therefore we shall be content with the shorter, and probably more satisfactory, form of investigation, that is, we shall seek an explanation from the guiding authority of the Church.

#### b) *Definition of Vocation as given by the Church*

There is one important document that has a direct bearing upon the matter in hand. It is a decision given under Pius X putting an end to several controversies regarding the meaning of vocation in general and in particular regarding a book, *La Vocation Sacerdotale*, written in 1909 by Canon Joseph Lahitton.<sup>18</sup> The decree is not very long. First there is a short preamble giving the occasion and the necessity for an authoritative statement; then there is a clear cut decision entirely exonerating the author, Lahitton, from all suspicion of unorthodoxy; after this follow three propositions, taken from *La Vocation Sacerdotale*, which are singled out for approbation and for special meed of praise; last of all there is the injunction that the decree be made public *ex integro*. The preamble and the ending of the decree do not concern us here; but the three propositions have reference to our question so we reproduce them in full:

- 1) No one at any time has a right to ordination prior to the free choice of the bishop:
- 2) The condition that must be verified in the ordinandus and which is called priestly vocation by no means consists, at least

<sup>15</sup>Della Costa, *Videte Vocationem Vcstram*, page 5: "Ecco la vocazione. Per cui lo studio della propria vocazione per il seminarista consiste nel vedere se possieda le qualità indispensabili per essere buon sacerdote". Jorio, *Sacerdos Alter Christus*, page 40-42. Coogan, cf. *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, March, 1946, page 443.

<sup>16</sup>Cappello, *De Sacra Ordinatione*, n. 363, lists seven different definitions.

<sup>17</sup>A Study of Tradition on this question of vocation is found in *La Vocation au Sacerdoce*, by Alphonse Mulders.

<sup>18</sup>This book had several editions; quotations here are from the second edition, 1913.



necessarily and as a general rule, in a certain internal aspiration of the candidate or in any invitation of the Holy Spirit to enter the priesthood:

- 3) on the contrary, in order that the candidate may be lawfully called by his bishop, nothing more is required than a right intention together with a fitness based on such gifts of grace and nature and confirmed by such probity of life and sufficiency of learning as will give rise to a well founded hope that the candidate will be able to properly assume the duties of the priesthood and to faithfully discharge the obligations of that state.<sup>19</sup>

Of these three propositions the second and third are of paramount importance to the correct understanding of the word vocation when used of young men. This decision is not an infallible pronouncement; yet it bears the express approbation of the Holy Father and it does give us the mind of the Church regarding the essence or constituent elements of sacerdotal vocation. Three things are made very clear: a) the word sacerdotal vocation is used expressly, b) it is applied to young men, or even boys, before they receive any official call from the bishop, c) and the meaning of the word used in this fashion is explained. It is the third point which focuses the attention of the attentive reader.

The second proposition mentions a certain condition, called sacerdotal vocation, which must be found in every candidate before he is summoned by the bishop. If this vocation be discovered then the candidate may be summoned to the sanctuary; but it does not give him any right to be called. On the other hand if this condition be absent then the bishop cannot, without sin, ordain the young man. The sequence of word and idea then gives us the exact meaning of this necessary condition. In the second proposition we are told, negatively, what it is not; in the third proposition we are told, positively, what it is. Negatively, it is not, at least in ordinary cases, any aspiration or desire or yearning on the part of the candidate: nor is it any special invitation on the part of the Holy Spirit. From the whole context of the papal

---

191) Neminem habere unquam jus ullum ad ordinationem antecederet ad liberam electionem Episcopi:

2) Conditionem quae ex parte Ordinandi debet attendi, quaeque vocatio sacerdotalis appellatur, nequaquam consistere, saltem necessario et de lege ordinaria, in interna quadam adspiratione subjecti seu invitamentis Sancti, ad sacerdotium ineundum:

3) Sed e contra, nihil plus in Ordinando, ut rite vocetur ab Episcopo, requiri quam rectam intentionem, simul cum idoneitate in iis gratiae et naturae dotibus reposita, et per eam vitae probitatem ac doctrinae sufficientiam comprobata, quae spem fundatam faciant fore sacerdotii munera recte obire ejusdem obligationes sancte servare queat.

The full text can be found in the *Act. Apost. Sedis*, 1912, page 485.

decision it is certain that the aspiration here alluded to is that overpowering, imperious motion of the will, and the invitation of the Holy Spirit is that well nigh irresistible impulse of grace spoken of by such men as Kroust, Branchereau, Olier, and Tronson. This school of thought received its coup de grâce from the pen of Lahitton.<sup>20</sup> Be it noted however that the Holy See leaves us free to infer that such desires can exist, but they are not the ordinary run of vocations. Positively the necessary condition, vocation, is made up of several elements, viz., right intention, gifts of grace and certain qualities of nature pertaining both to the spiritual and the bodily order. That is all. In those few, deft lines the Holy See swept aside so many erroneous notions that had been clogging the thought of writers for decades and at the same time gave us an authoritative statement as to the meaning of the term sacerdotal vocation when applied to young men. We might paraphrase the decision thus: that condition, called sacerdotal vocation, which is required in every candidate before the bishop may lawfully ordain him is not, in ordinary cases, any special yearning or any special impulse of grace towards the priesthood but it consists in right intention together with certain gifts of grace and certain qualifications of nature. The thing seems so simple now that we are left wondering why it was not thought of before or why there had been such bother about it; but that is usually the case when a hitherto obscure problem has been finally clarified.

The papal decision of 1912 does not tell us in detail what are the gifts of grace and nature which make up this vocation. Nor was there any real need to do so because the pronouncement was meant as a decree not as an instruction or explanation. That explanation can be found elsewhere. It is contained in the pages of Sacred Scripture, particularly in the Pauline Letters; it is found also in the writings of Tradition, for instance in the treatise of Saint John Chrysostom and the *Lex Levitarum* of Gregory the Great.<sup>21</sup> These gifts are briefly outlined in the *Codex of Canon Law*, Book III, Titulus VI, XXI; while a more inspiring treatment can be had in the Encyclicals *Haerent Animo* of Pius X<sup>22</sup> and *ad Catholici Sacerdotii Fastigium* of Pius XI.<sup>23</sup> For a very scholarly discussion of the whole matter we can warmly recommend *La Vocation Sacerdotale* of Lahitton, or the conferences of Cardinal Mercier, or, perhaps best of all, the "*Vocation to*

<sup>20</sup>*La Vocation Sacerdotale*, page 6, 9, 118.

<sup>21</sup>cf. *Priest of the Fathers*, by Edward L. Heston, C.S.C.

<sup>22</sup> 4 August, 1908. *Fontes Juris Canonici* III, n. 683.

<sup>23</sup> 20 December, 1935. *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 1936, pages 5-53.

the Priesthood, a doctrinal treatment of its essence and marks" by the Right Reverend Wilhelm Stockums, Auxiliary Bishop of Cologne.<sup>24</sup>

Now we are in a position to give answer to the question set above: just what is meant when it is said that a boy has a vocation? We mean that he is possessed of that right intention and those gifts of grace and nature which fit him for the assuming and the discharge of the duties of the sacerdotal state. This is the express meaning of the word as given by the Holy See.

### *Terminology which avoids Ambiguity*

Having shown what is meant by the word vocation as applied to a young man before he receives the official summons to ordination we must now endeavour to find some form of speech which will correctly express this meaning without danger of confusion or ambiguity. There are two suggested ways of doing this: one is to practically eliminate the word vocation while the other is to retain it but qualify it with certain distinctions.

#### a) *Proposal made by Canon Lahitton*

Early in the present century Lahitton put forth what he frankly admitted to be a novel and radical method of cutting clean away from all equivocation in the use of the word vocation. He suggested nothing less than a change of terminology with a partial, if not a total, discarding of the word vocation.<sup>25</sup> Instead of using the word vocation to designate that condition or qualification which must be found prior to sacramental ordination he openly hinted that the term fitness, *idoneité*, would be more suitable. But, bowing to current usage, he finally admitted that it would be advisable to retain the word vocation, making sure to clarify its exact meaning, to purify it of all exaggeration and to restrict its use to designate those things required in a candidate before the bishop may lawfully ordain him.<sup>26</sup> Leaving the word vocation

<sup>24</sup>cf. The paper by His Grace Archbishop Simonds—*Acts of the Adelaide Congress*, 1936, pages 236-243; and *Ecclesiastical Vocations*, by Father Osmond Thorpe, C.P. (Adelaide).

<sup>25</sup>"Que faire de ce mot? Que faire de ce mot vocation si fécond en équivoque? Le meilleure (solution) serait, semble-t-il de le ramener—si c'était possible—à la signification purement active qu'il avait dans le latin classique... Que faire donc? Recourir à une solution tout à fait radicale". *La Vocation Sacerdotale*, nn. 126, 128.

<sup>26</sup>"Néanmoins, il faut avouer, l'usage, qui se pose en maître absolu des langues, tend à faire predominer de plus en plus, dans le mot 'vocation' le sens passif". *La Vocation Sacerdotale*, n. 128. "Que contiendra donc l'appel secundum quid? Que désignera nécessairement le mot vocation? Ce quis est requis pour se présenter légitimement au jugement, au choix et à l'appel de l'évêque: l'idoneité, mais dégagée de tous ses accessoires illégitimement ajoutés; l'idoneité, présupposant d'ailleurs, la perpétuelle action de la grâce, qui a présidé à tout le travail de formation". *ibidem*, n. 131.



solely for that necessary condition Lahitton then went on to his altogether new suggestion asking that the summons of the bishop, which his contemporaries also called vocation, should be given an entirely new name, call, or, as he expressly wrote, *l'appel*.<sup>27</sup> But while making this proposal Lahitton himself was the first to admit the difficulty and to question the lawfulness of altering accepted terminology. He was quite aware of the adage—*nominibus utendum ut plures*—of Saint Thomas.<sup>28</sup> In the vocabulary of the Church there are certain words like consubstantial, transubstantiation, matrimonial impediment, domicile which take their meaning from an authoritative definition: there are other words and phrases like hearing Mass, secular clergy, social justice, whose meaning has been clarified by accepted usage either official or unofficial. Now it is not lawful for private people, singly or in groups, to suddenly alter current words and their accepted meaning. This was just Lahitton's position and he knew it. Therefore, although he did not disguise his own preference for a change, yet he was too wise and too prudent to force its introduction. He merely proposed the alteration. The Church however has not accepted his suggestion,<sup>29</sup> even though here and there some agree with him. The traditional word vocation remains; and, if recent documents of the Holy See are any indication, it will remain.

#### b) *Common method of Writers*

There is another and, pace Lahitton, a better way of avoiding the confusion in the use of the word vocation. It is the obvious scholastic method of introducing distinctions. The term vocation refers to both the call given by the bishop and also to certain gifts of grace and nature in every candidate. Very well then, let it stand; but let the meaning be clarified by the addition of an adjective to the noun according as it is used of one or the other. Vocation in the sense of the summons of

<sup>27</sup>"Que faire donc? Recourir à une troisième solution tout a fait radicale: laisser au mot 'vocation' cette signification passive que l'usage lui impose, mais réagir contre l'usage en épurant ce mot d' une foule d' éléments parasites qu'on y a subrepticement glissés; puis demander à l'usage lui-même un autre mot, qui soit synonyme de la "vocatio" des latins, sans avoir subi les multiples défigurations de notre mot vocation. CE MOT EXISTE: c'est le mot APPEL". (The capitals are Lahitton's) *La Vocation Sacerdotale*, n. 128.

<sup>28</sup>"Mais il n'est au pouvoir de personne de changer le langage". *La Vocation Sacerdotale*, n. 126.

<sup>29</sup>Occasionally it is said that because the Holy See approved Lahitton's *La Vocation Sacerdotale* it follows that everything therein written bears the approbation of Rome. If this were true we would have to conclude that the Holy See does not want us to use the term vocation in reference to the summons of the bishop. Such a conclusion needs no refutation.

the Church is known as canonical vocation, ecclesiastical vocation, episcopal vocation, active vocation, formal vocation, vocation simpliciter, external vocation; but when applied to that definite requisite condition it is called divine vocation (as distinct from canonical, ecclesiastical, episcopal vocation), passive vocation, material vocation, vocation secundum quid, internal vocation.<sup>30</sup>

This is the traditional method by which Theologians (and official documents too) have avoided ambiguity or equivocation in the use of the word vocation. The confusion so rightly complained of by Lahitton arose not so much from the term canonical vocation and divine vocation but rather from a misunderstanding of the meaning of the distinction, particularly in regard to divine vocation. Lahitton's chief claim to our gratitude is that he demonstrated conclusively the correct sense of the term; and his teaching on this point was publicly endorsed by the supreme authority of the Church. Hence to avoid ambiguity it is not necessary to jettison the traditional terminology; it is sufficient to retain it, insisting always that it be rightly understood and correctly used.

#### *Adequate definition of sacerdotal vocation*

The third point for treatment in this article concerns an adequate definition of sacerdotal vocation. We know what canonical vocation means; we know, too, what divine vocation is. Are these two entirely distinct one from the other? And if so, which is the true, genuine sacerdotal vocation in the strict sense of the word? Or are they two different parts combining to form the one complete whole, the adequate, formal sacerdotal vocation? Herein lies the very crux of present day discussion regarding the formal definition of vocation. As already stated this paper does not aim to settle the matter in any definitive fashion; our purpose is rather to indicate the several viewpoints and to suggest, if we may suggest where Doctors in Israel differ, what we think the final solution should contain.

Joseph Lahitton takes the stand, definite and uncompromising, that the sacerdotal vocation in its proper, formal sense is restricted to the call of the bishop. For him the bishop's call alone creates priestly

<sup>30</sup>This manner of distinction can be found in the words of Many, Schnieder, Stockums, Lahitton, Jorio, Della Costa, Wernz, Mulders, Vidal, as quoted above in this article; the same kind of distinction is found also in Bucceroni, *Theologiae Moralis*, II, 897; Noldin, *Theologiae Moralis*, II, 752; Aertneys Damen, *Theologia Moralis*, II, 851; Ferreres, *Theologiae Moralis*, II, 921-922; Merkelbach, *Theologiae Moralis*, III, 739; Prummer, *Theologiae Moralis*, III, 602; Cappello, *De Sacramentis*, Vol. II, par. III, pages 327-381; and others.

vocation!<sup>31</sup> a true definition therefore must exclude all reference to the divine or passive vocation. It was this which led him to alter in 1910 the definition given earlier in 1909.<sup>32</sup>

There is another school of thought which contends that the adequate, true definition must include the divine vocation as well as the canonical vocation. Both are necessary. "A complete vocation is present only when the external, canonical vocation by the bishop has been added to the interior, divine vocation".<sup>33</sup> This latter view is not only the far more common opinion; it might also be called the traditional opinion;<sup>34</sup> and it is certainly more consonant with the official utterances of the Holy See.

We do not intend to ponder the arguments pro et contra; but all must admit that both the decision of 1912 and the Codex of Canon Law make it abundantly clear that the divine vocation is something unconditionally necessary; it is equally certain the episcopal call is necessary. The position is such that the call of the bishop is morally without effect or meaning when the divine call is actually missing;<sup>35</sup> according to the Instruction of 1930, referred to above, a bishop who ordains a candidate, not possessed of a divine vocation, opens the gate shielding Christ's flock to a thief and a robber. Hence it seems that an adequate definition must include both the divine and the canonical vocation.

To describe how the divine and the canonical vocation combine to form the complete sacerdotal vocation is not our present purpose: nevertheless we propose one trend of thought. It is not our own for we have learned it from others; but we confess a liking for it. Vocation is a calling. Sacerdotal vocation in the broadest sense of the word is God's call to the priesthood. Two things are necessary: God must first choose His future priest and then He must communicate His divine will to the person of His choice. Now God could manifest His choice in many ways; but de facto He does it, in two ways. In so far as a candidate may lawfully approach the Altar only if he possess certain gifts of grace and nature and only if he be summoned by the Church it is concluded that God reveals His will both by endowing the person with these qualities and also through the instrumentality of the

---

<sup>31</sup>La vocation pure et simple, la vocation au sens plein et formel et actif, c'est l'acte officiel de l'évêque". *La Vocation Sacerdotale*, n. 127.

<sup>32</sup>This explicit avowal is contained in *Deux Conceptions divergentes de la Vocation Sacerdotale*, page 22.

<sup>33</sup>Stockums, *Vocation to the Priesthood*, page 35.

<sup>34</sup>*vide* Mulders, *La Vocation au Sacerdoce*.

<sup>35</sup>*vide* Stockums, *Vocation to the Priesthood*, page 81.



bishops of His Church. This means that the gifts of grace and the qualities of nature alluded to have a twofold function—a constitutive function and a significative function; they constitute the elements of what the Church calls divine vocation (as distinct from canonical vocation) and they are also a manifestation of what is necessarily hidden, viz., God's choice. In other words these gifts of grace and nature at the self same time both manifest God's will, and in the very manifesting they constitute God's invitation to the sacerdotal ministry. They signify God's choice and they are the manifestation of that choice.

What is here said of the divine vocation can be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the canonical vocation.<sup>36</sup>

According to this manner of thought sacerdotal vocation fully understood comprises first God's choice, then the manifestation of it through the qualities of the candidate and finally through the official call given in the name of the Church.<sup>37</sup>

In this fashion God's call to the priesthood is something gradual, orderly, constant. It is a plant that follows normal growth; sown as a seed in the heart of a child it develops as a choice flower will develop; in orderly fashion it puts forth first one, then a second, then a third unmistakable sign of divine favour; it grows strong as its quality is probed and tested until it ripens into mature bloom; then comes the culmination with the solemn imposition of hands, and the seedling, so long ago planted by God in fruitful soil, at last gives forth the sweet odour of Christ. It is God's work from beginning to end; God chooses the reaper for His harvest, God communicates His will to the well beloved friend of His choice; and the priest so blessed may say in all humility and gratitude 'God has chosen me'.

### *Conclusions.*

Having accomplished as best we can the threefold purpose set ourselves it is now time to gather together the various threads and form them into their proper pattern. Therefore, by way of conclusion, we summarise our findings and recapitulate them under the following several headings:—

- 1) The word vocation is used both of the episcopal summons to the Altar and also of a certain condition required in every

---

<sup>36</sup>*ibidem*. Chapters I, II, III, VI.

<sup>37</sup>"Septima (sententia de vocationis definitione) censet vocationem adequate sumptam triplice elemento constare, scil. speciali vocatione ex parte Dei, canonica idoneitate ex parte candidati, ..... et admissione ad statum ecclesiasticum ex parte Episcopi". Cappello, *De Sacra Ordinatione*, n. 363.

- candidate before the bishop may lawfully give that summons. (This cannot be denied.)
- 2) This antecedent condition consists, ordinarily, in right intention, gifts of grace and certain qualities of nature. (This cannot be denied.)
  - 3) In order to avoid confusion in the use of the word vocation the majority of Theologians name the requisite condition of right intention, etc., divine vocation, while they call the episcopal summons canonical vocation.
  - 4) In order to avoid the same confusion Joseph Lahitton proposed to keep the word 'vocation', unqualified, for the antecedent condition and to substitute a new word, "appel", for the canonical vocation. As far as we know his suggestion has not been generally adopted; and we haven't seen any reference to it in official documents.
  - 5) Recent official documents of the Holy See have spoken of the antecedent condition as divine vocation, sacred vocation, etc. (This cannot be denied.)
  - 6) Theologians differ as to whether a formal, adequate definition of sacerdotal vocation should be restricted to the canonical vocation or whether it should also include the divine vocation.
  - 7) As far as we have studied the matter the majority of Theologians hold that the adequate, formal definition must include both the divine and the canonical vocation.

HENRY J. JORDAN, M.S.C.

# Moral Theology

## ASSISTANCE AT MARRIAGE, *PAROCHUS PUTATIVUS*.

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. Is assistance at a marriage an act of jurisdiction on the part of the priest?

2. A priest knows he has no jurisdiction, but the parties to a marriage think he is their parish priest. Is such a marriage valid? If not, what is the meaning of Noldin's words: *Valide assistit etiam parochus putativus, qui parochus non est, sed errore communi talis esse putatur, etsi titulum coloratum non habeat.* (Vol. III, par. 637, no. 2. Ed. 1940)?

3. Is a *parochus putativus* one who thinks he is the parish priest; or one who knows he is not, but is considered by the faithful to be their parish priest?

M.F.

### REPLY.

1. Assistance at a marriage is not strictly an act of jurisdiction, but it is often referred to as such, and certain of the canonical prescriptions concerning jurisdiction are applied to it.

The power of jurisdiction is alternatively called the power of ruling, *potestas regiminis*,<sup>1</sup> and is usually defined as the power of ruling subjects with a view, in the case of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, to directing them towards their supernatural end. It includes the authority to make laws, to pass a sentence of judgment and to inflict penalties.<sup>2</sup> The administration of the Sacrament of Penance implies the passing of a sentence of remission or retention of sin, and also the infliction of something in the nature of a penalty by way of sacramental satisfaction. This is a use of jurisdiction in the strict sense, and a priest who attempts to give absolution without jurisdiction, either ordinary or delegated, acts invalidly. The administration of the other sacraments, however, does not require jurisdiction, for it is the use of another of the powers which Christ gave to the Church, the *potestas sanctificandi*. It is true, nevertheless, that a priest cannot administer the Sacraments to all and sundry, but to those only over whom he has some authority. The reason of this is that the priest is the minister of the Church and can act lawfully only in so far as the Church commissions him. It is not necessary to multiply examples: suffice it to recall that solemn

---

<sup>1</sup>Can. 196.

<sup>2</sup>cf. Can. 335.



Baptism, the administration of the Viaticum and of Extreme Unction are reserved in Law to the parish priest. With regard to the Sacrament of Matrimony, about which our correspondent enquires, the parties and not the priest administer the Sacrament, the priest being present merely as a qualified witness, without whom—outside definitely excepted cases—the contract is invalid. Nor will it suffice to have any priest to witness the marriage: he must be the local Ordinary or the parish priest of the place where the marriage is contracted, or a priest delegated by either of them. Further, for the lawfulness of the marriage, one at least of the parties must be the subject, by reason of not less than a month's residence in his territory, of the clergyman who either assists himself at the marriage, or deposes another to do so for him. So, when we consider the conditions necessary for valid and lawful assistance at a marriage, there is a close analogy to the possession of true jurisdiction. For validity, the priest must be possessed of territorial jurisdiction, or be duly delegated by one who is; while for lawfulness, one of the contracting parties must be his subject, or be given permission by (his or) her proper pastor. Thus it is not to be wondered at that the assistance at a marriage is often referred to as an act of jurisdiction, though it is neither legislative nor judicial nor coercive in its nature. It is an act which cannot be performed either validly or lawfully without jurisdiction. Canonists interpret the authority to assist at a marriage according to the same restrictions and extensions as they interpret the power of jurisdiction. The Code (Can. 1094) refers to the authorisation of another priest to assist at a marriage as "delegation", while the principles of jurisdiction "supplied by the Church" in certain cases have been applied in this connection since the time of the Council of Trent. This brings us to the next question.

2. The mistake of the contracting parties who think the priest is the parish priest, when he really is not, would not make his assistance valid; and so the contract in normal circumstances, would be null and void, if the misapprehension were confined to the parties to the marriage. But if there is a general opinion in the locality that the priest in question is the parish priest, then one could invoke Can. 209, which states: "In common error...the Church supplies jurisdiction in both the external and the internal forum". For the sake of the public good, the Church supplies what is lacking by way of jurisdiction, and so his acts are valid, if it is commonly thought that the priest concerned does possess the necessary authority. An error is a mistaken judgment and it is called *common* in contradistinction to a *private* error which exists

only in the minds of a few. Let us suppose that for some legitimate reason a priest is deprived of his parish: only the curate and one or two of the people know it. Such a priest assists at a marriage: he does so unlawfully, but validly. Though he does not habitually possess the necessary jurisdiction, the Church gives it to him at the moment of the marriage. This state of things would continue until it was public knowledge that he was no longer the parish priest; and in the meantime, he is what the authors call a *parochus putativus*. On the other hand, if it were already common knowledge that the priest, whom we imagine, was deprived by Ecclesiastical authority of his parish, but some few did not know of it, among them the parties at whose marriage he assisted, the Church would not supply the jurisdiction and the contract would be invalid because of defect of form. From these remarks the meaning of Noldin's words quoted by our correspondent is clear enough, though the reference to the *titulus coloratus* may cause some difficulty. By a *titulus* is meant the act which is the basis or foundation to a right. Thus the *titulus* to parochial jurisdiction would be the legitimate canonical provision. The *titulus* would be *coloratus* when the provision was made, but because of some legal flaw was invalid. Before the promulgation of the Code many authors maintained that the Church did not supply jurisdiction in the case of common error, unless there were some seeming title to the jurisdiction. The existence of a title is no longer required that jurisdiction be supplied by the Church: it is sufficient that the priest is commonly considered to have the jurisdiction, no matter what be the occasion of the mistaken judgment of the public.

3. The answer to this section is already implied in what is written above. The judgment of the Parish Priest as to the validity of his position does not really make any difference, as he is only one individual. What is required is that the false impression be widespread.

\* \* \* \*

#### OBLIGATION OF CHEMIST'S ASSISTANT.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Is the assistant in a Chemist's shop where contraceptives are sold bound *sub gravi* to leave his position?

M.F.

#### REPLY.

The answer to this query depends on two questions: 1) Does the Chemist's assistant co-operate in the sin of the purchaser formally or only materially? and 2) if the co-operation is not formal but material,

is there sufficient reason which justifies him in permitting the sin of another?

With regard to the first point, it can safely be held that the co-operation is material. The contract of buying and selling is between the customer and the master chemist, the assistant being only an agent who hands the articles over the counter and receives the purchase price. He does not necessarily approve of the sale, and in the circumstances there is nothing to imply that he does.

He does, however, co-operate materially; and the law of Charity binds us *sub gravi* to prevent the sin of another, if we can do so without proportionate inconvenience. To give up the promise of a successful professional career is an inconvenience which we do not think the assistant is bound to suffer; merely to change his employer, when he can do so without trouble, would be something which it seems he would be obliged to do. Frequently such a change would be out of the question; and as long as it is, there does not appear to be any obligation to be imposed on the anxious Chemist's assistant. The writer of these Notes in 1929 summed up the position of such a man: *non est inquietandus*.<sup>3</sup> With this conclusion we agree.

\*

\*

\*

\*

#### SUFFICIENT MATTER FOR THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE.

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. Can sins committed before Baptism be sufficient matter for the Sacrament of Penance? What would a confessor do in the case of a convert, who after his reception into the Church received conditional absolution and thereafter led a good life, falling into imperfections or sometimes venial sins, but never into sins which are certainly mortal? If such a penitent is asked for a sin of his past life, he will manifest something which was committed before his conditional Baptism. Should the confessor continue to give him conditional absolution or should he be content with a blessing?

2. In the assumption that sins committed before Baptism are not sufficient matter for absolution, should the confessor ask his penitents who are converts if the sin of their past life was committed before or after their conditional Baptism?

ADM.

---

<sup>3</sup>A.C.R., 1929, p. 52.



## REPLY.

Sins committed before Baptism are not sufficient matter for the Sacrament of Penance. Sacramental absolution is an exercise of jurisdiction and the confessor, as the minister of the Church, has no power over acts which were performed before his penitent became a member of the Church through Baptism. If the person, on his reception into the true Church were baptised conditionally, then the sins committed after his former doubtful baptism and before his conditional reception of the sacrament of regeneration are doubtful matter for absolution. If they are the only sins confessed, the confessor gives conditional absolution: and this is what he does at the confession made on the occasion of the reception of a convert.

What is to be done at the subsequent confessions? It is a principle that the sacraments are not to be exposed to the danger of invalidity: only when there is sufficient reason may a priest administer them with such a risk, and then always safeguarding the reverence due to the sacrament by the insertion of a condition which modifies his intention. If we apply this principle to our case, we may reach a conclusion.

1) The penitent confesses only imperfections. They are not sufficient matter, because they are not sins. In answer to the confessor who asks for a sin of his past life, he tells some, let us say, serious fault of the days when he lived outside the Church. The priest knows this. There is no reason which will justify conditional absolution, as the penitent suffers no loss by being dismissed with a blessing.

2) The penitent tells venial sins committed recently and some serious fault of his past life. The priest should satisfy himself of the presence of contrition for at least one of the venial sins and give his penitent absolution absolutely. If he cannot come to the conclusion about the presence of such contrition—and this we think will be a rare occurrence—he should refrain from giving absolution, as there is not sufficient reason for absolving conditionally.

3) The penitent makes known a sin which is doubtfully a grave sin, but probably not a sin at all, on account of lack of consent, and with it also some sin of his past life. If absolution is not given, the person will remain perhaps in the state of mortal sin; if it is, the sacrament may be invalid. The danger of leaving the penitent in the state of serious sin is sufficient reason to absolve him conditionally.

2. This portion of the query may be answered also by a distinction. If the convert penitent confesses matter certainly sufficient, has the necessary sorrow and is otherwise disposed, he is absolved abso-

lutely, and there is no need to worry about sins of his past life which may be included: the Sacrament is valid without any reference to them. If, however, he confesses only doubtful matter, the manifestation of some other sin which is certainly sufficient, because committed after Baptism, would enable the confessor to give absolution absolutely. In this case, we think he should ask so as to know what intention to form with regard to the absolution. Of course, in many cases, the confessor will not know or suspect his penitent is a convert, and it seems he can do no more than absolve with a general intention, as he always does, *faciendi quod facit Ecclesia*

\* \* \* \*

### TIME FOR FULFILLING MASS OBLIGATIONS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Moralists teach that a priest who has received a stipend to celebrate a Mass for an intention must do so within the *tempus utile*, if such be the nature of the case. Otherwise he is bound *sub gravi* to restore the stipend, unless the donor's condonation can be presumed. Now, if the celebrant is lawfully impeded from celebrating this Mass within the appointed time and can get no other priest to say it for him, may he interpret *tempus utile* in accordance with Can. 35 and say the Mass, even though the purpose for which this Mass is asked has already occurred? Let us suppose the purpose of the Mass was a child's success in an examination which took place on Monday.

CANUS.

We think that CANUS is using the term *tempus utile* in two different senses. In the first instance, it is taken to mean the time within which the purpose of the Mass could be obtained as the impetratory effect of the holy Sacrifice; in the second case, it has a definite legal significance, as distinguished from *tempus continuum*. When a right may be claimed in law within a stated time, it is usually understood that the time runs without interruption, even though the person for portion of it were incapable of exercising his right. There are, however, definite occasions when the time is specified as *tempus utile*, and then the days when it was impossible to make use of the advantage of the law are not counted as included in the total number allowed. The expression *tempus utile* does occur in connection with the celebration of Masses for a stipend as we shall presently see.

The obligation of celebrating Mass for a stipend is a grave one binding in justice; it is the result of a contract between the person who gives the stipend and the priest who agrees to say the Mass. The

circumstance of time may or may not be included in the agreement; it may even be expressly waived, should the donor desire to leave the celebration entirely to the convenience of the priest. There are thus three hypotheses: 1) the day of the Mass is agreed upon, 2) it is not mentioned, and 3) it is definitely excluded.

If the date of the Mass is agreed upon, then the presumption is that the circumstance of time enters into the essence of the contract, and the priest who does not fulfil it has no right to retain the stipend. It should be noted that the date of the Mass could be agreed upon in different ways. A priest could be asked to say Mass, let us say, on next Tuesday—then he is bound to say it or have another priest say it on Tuesday. He could take a stipend to say Mass “some day next week”—and the Mass must be celebrated accordingly. In these examples, the date of the Mass is definitely fixed, or at any rate confined to the choice of the days of one week. The time for the Mass could also be necessarily implied in the intention for which it is requested, as is suggested in the case referred to by our correspondent, for the success of an examination on Monday. It is evident enough that the Mass should be said not later than Monday and that this condition was accepted by the priest who took the stipend. The question then arises, what should be done with the stipend, if the Mass is not offered as agreed? As the priest has not fulfilled his part of the contract, he should, strictly speaking, give it back. Whether the gravity of the obligation of restitution depends on the amount of the stipend is not so clear; but it appears sufficiently safe to maintain that it is to be determined by the amount of the stipend, for this is what is now a *res injuste possessa*. The ordinary stipend of five shillings would not constitute grave matter in justice, and so the obligation to restitution would not be serious. Further, the danger of loss of reputation, etc., would also be factors in excusing the priest from restitution. In the circumstances, we think that all he can do is to celebrate a Mass for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the donor, on the presumption that this is what the latter would desire to have him do.

The second hypothesis is that the date of the Mass does not come into the request for its celebration. The intention may be urgent, but the reason for it does not cease on a definite date, so as to imply that the Mass must be celebrated within a time which can be ordinarily foreseen. An example would be recovery from a serious illness where there is no danger of immediate death. On the other hand, there may be no urgency about the intention for which the Mass is requested, as,



let us suppose, the general welfare of the donor's family. If the matter is urgent, the Mass must be said according to Can. 834, p. 2, n. 1, *quamprimum tempore utili*. What is the meaning of *tempore utili*? Is it used in the technical sense of Can. 35, so that *quamprimum tempore utili* means: as soon as can be with due allowance for the days on which the priest is lawfully impeded? Or is the term to be so understood: that at the time when the Mass is said the benefit desired can still be obtained? It may be argued that the first interpretation is the more likely one. One reason for this opinion is that, if taken in the second meaning, the Law states something superfluous, for no one wants a Mass said for something he can no longer hope to receive; and so it is an implied condition in the request for Masses offered for favours that they be said while their impetratory effect, as far as one can foresee, is possible. Moreover, in this hypothesis, it is not known when the intention of the Mass will be without purpose, and it is hard to see how a priest, or any one else for that matter, can be bound to do something within a time the limit of which is unknown. Nevertheless, we are of opinion that the term *tempus utile* here means the time within which the benefit can be obtained, just as in Can. 899, par. 3, *tempus ad praeceptum paschale adimplendum utile* means the time within which the paschal precept may be fulfilled. So the phrase *quamprimum tempore utile* signifies as soon as possible according to the nature of the urgent matter for which the Mass is requested. There are thus two considerations to be attended to: that the Mass be said while the request is possible (*tempore utili*), and secondly, since a definite term cannot be assigned to this possibility, that it be said without delay (*quamprimum*).<sup>4</sup> Therefore, to make sure that the Mass will be said while the reason for it still is verified, the Law states that it should be celebrated as soon as possible within the bounds of practical possibility.

---

<sup>4</sup>Augustine (vol. IV, p. 197) writes: "Urgent Masses must be said as soon as possible, within an equitable period. Thus if a Mass is ordered for a successful operation or child birth, it is supposed to be said before or on the day of the event. However, the Legislator says *tempus utile* (Can. 35), which means: if the Priest is not occupied with other intentions or obligations. Should he take sick or be lawfully prevented on the day on which he is obliged to say the stipulated Mass, he would have to ask another Priest to say the Mass in his stead, provided he could find one who was willing and able; if not he may keep the stipend and say the Mass as soon as possible". With these last words we cannot find ourselves in agreement, for it is surely an implied condition in every offering of a Mass stipend that the Mass be celebrated before the event for the success of which it is requested. The retention of the stipend and the celebration of a Mass for the donor's intentions can be justified only because of extrinsic considerations.

Blat (Commentarium Lib. III, p. I, p. 158) has: *Missae pro urgenti causa oblatae... dummodo sciatur* (a) *quam primum pro causae urgentia et omnino* (b) *tempore utili, non ad normam can. 35 sed scilicet quando offerentis intentio consequi potest effectum, sunt celebrandae*. This is the opinion we have adopted.

If the reason for the Masses is not urgent, they must be said within a short time (*modicum tempus*) according to the greater or lesser number of Masses requested. The usual interpretation of the *modicum tempus* is one month for one Mass, six months for a hundred Masses and so on, according to the norms set down in the Decree *Ut debita* (11th March, 1904). In the *Epitome Juris Canonici* of Vermeersch-Creusen, vol. II, p. 58, there is a formula, which the author states is borrowed from a Professor of Canon Law, which summarises the rules for the time allowed for Manual Masses. We may be pardoned if we too presume to borrow it.

$$X = N + \frac{N}{2} + 30.$$

where X represents the number of days allowed, and N the number of Masses requested from the same person.

The third possibility is that the donor expressly leaves the time of the celebration to the discretion of the priest. In this case, he can say it at his convenience, with the limitation that no priest is to accept more obligations for Masses than he can discharge within a year.

We may now be in a position to answer CANUS his question. As he understands *tempus utile* to mean the time within which the request can be granted by virtue of the Mass (according to his example the success of a child at an examination on Monday) this is a case where the time for the Mass is expressly implied. If he does not say the Mass or have it said before Monday, for whatever reason, he has not fulfilled his part of the contract and has no strict right to retain the stipend. *Per se* he is bound to restore it, but circumstances will usually excuse him, and he does the best he can *post factum* by offering a Mass for the general intentions of the donor of the stipend.

\* \* \* \*

## COMMUNION OF THE SICK AND THE EUCHARISTIC FAST.

Dear Rev. Sir,

In the case of an *infirmus* who is to receive Holy Communion at home, but needs a dispensation for the Eucharistic fast, how is the curate to act, when only the priest in charge has the delegated faculty from the Formula Major, n. 18:—

a) if the need for the dispensation is known some time before the hour of the reception of Holy Communion? The curate tells the priest in charge of the case: what then?

b) if the need for the dispensation is known only at the time of reception? The curate cannot communicate with the priest in charge,

e.g., he is about to give Holy Communion; and the sick man says: "I had a drink an hour ago". Presuming that this is not a case for Can. 858, 2, what then? Is it a case for epikia?

PASTOR.

REPLY.

a) When the curate tells the priest in charge of the case, the decision as to the sufficiency of the reason for a dispensation from the fast rests with the latter. If he is satisfied that there is real need, he will grant the dispensation by virtue of the faculty he has from the Holy See through the medium of the local Ordinary. Should he deem it wise, he can make independent enquiries, or he may take the word of his assistant. Once the dispensation is granted, any priest may administer the Blessed Eucharist. The terms of the faculty are to allow the sick, who are without hope of speedy recovery, to receive Holy Communion two or three times a week, even though they have taken medicine or something by way of drink. On the other days they may communicate, if they wish, fasting from midnight, as do the ordinary members of the faithful. If the priest in charge is not satisfied as to the reason for the dispensation, the sick man remains fasting or does not receive Communion.

b) As this is not a case covered by Can. 858, 2,—or in other words the man has not been confined to bed for a month—and as the curate has no power to grant the dispensation, it seems there is only one thing to do and that is to offer words of sympathy and promise to return another morning, when either the invalid will be fasting or will, in the meantime, have secured a dispensation. We do not see any argument for the use of epikia. Epikia is a mild interpretation, according to equity, not of the law but of the mind of the legislator, who is presumed to consent to relaxation of the Law because in particular circumstances its observance is harmful or very burdensome and difficult. It is no great burden to be asked to omit Holy Communion because the Eucharistic fast has been broken, nor is there here any fear of loss of reputation, for breaking one's fast does not imply the commission of sin. Further, it is quite easy to obtain a dispensation in the case and there seems no occasion to have recourse to epikia.

Note: The faculty of granting a dispensation from the Eucharistic fast to those who are sick is given to the Ordinaries of Australia. Their Lordships have the power to sub-delegate this faculty, but to what extent the individual Bishops have done so, each priest can find out, in the case of his own Ordinary, by reference to his Faculty Sheet.

JAMES MADDEN.



# Canon Law

## I. QUESTIONS CONCERNING "SANATIO IN RADICE."

Dear Rev. Sir,

To convalidate the marriage of a Catholic wife and non-Catholic husband, performed by a Registrar of the State, the pastor obtained from the Local Ordinary a "sanatio in radice". Repeated efforts to induce the husband to renew his consent according to ecclesiastical law had proved unsuccessful. However, the wife had overcome his opposition to the Catholic upbringing of the children and he had agreed that all the children should be reared as Catholics. In fact, despite his opposition, she had insisted on this policy from the birth of their first child. He was unwilling to sign any guarantees. In reply to the Ordinary's query the pastor had no hesitation in stating his moral certainty that the non-Catholic husband would not impede the Catholic upbringing of all the children of the family. On the other hand, he recommended the petition in order to bring about peace of conscience for the wife. Now, doubts have been raised concerning the validity of the "sanatio" for the following reasons:

(1) Religious differences had given rise to repeated quarrels in the course of their married life. As a result, the husband had been known to state, on more than one occasion, that he wished they had never married, that he would gladly be free of his marriage obligations, that it had been a great mistake, etc. Some argue that his matrimonial consent could not have persevered in view of these expressions of sentiment.

(2) It has been revealed that the husband finally consented to the children's Catholic upbringing—which he had always opposed—only on condition that they continue to attend State Schools. The wife acquiesced in this demand. She refrained from mentioning this agreement to the pastor, fearing lest it prejudice her chances of obtaining the "sanatio". It is suggested that the concession was obtained under false pretences and that it is nullified as a result.

(3) It transpires, also, that, prior to the civil marriage, there was much discussion and some bitterness regarding the parties' differences of religion. Both refused to agree that any or all of their offspring should be reared in the other's religion. At one stage the wife agreed that, for the sake of peace, she would abandon her religion. This announcement put an end to their differences for a time, although she

did not discontinue the practice of her religion. But the other party was somewhat impressed by her statement and was influenced by it, to some extent, in making a final decision to marry. Was he so misled that his consent was nullified? I understand that the "sanatio" would be invalid if true consent were not given in the civil ceremony.

PRESBYTER.

# REPLY.

The various sets of circumstances described by PRESBYTER do not invalidate the "sanatio".

## (1) RETRACTING MATRIMONIAL CONSENT.

The validity of the "sanatio" cannot be called into question in view of the husband's repeated protestations of regret for having married etc. To render the "sanatio" invalid he would need to have withdrawn the matrimonial consent which was given at the civil ceremony. The several statements attributed to him do not constitute such a withdrawal.

It is necessary to explain in brief the nature of a "sanatio in radice." It is an extraordinary means of convalidating a marriage which is invalid by reason of an impediment of ecclesiastical origin or from defect of canonical form. A sanatio implies:

- (a) dispensation from or disappearance of the impediment,
- (b) dispensation from the obligation of renewing consent.
- (c) retraction, by means of a legal fiction as regards the canonical effects. (Canon 1138, 1).

The consent given by the contracting parties was *naturally* sufficient to constitute a marriage. But it was insufficient *juridically* either because an ecclesiastical law had rendered the parties ineligible to contract marriage with one another (diriment impediment), or because the form of consent prescribed by ecclesiastical law had not been observed. In granting a "sanatio" the ecclesiastical authority intervened to remove the ineligibility or the necessity of observing the prescribed form and, further, to relax the law which requires a renewal of consent in order that an invalid marriage may be convalidated. The mutual consent, sufficient of its nature to constitute marriage, is now considered as sufficient in law. The consent is the "radix" or "root" in which the contract is healed.

It is plain that for a "sanatio" to be valid, true matrimonial consent must have been given by both parties and this consent must persevere right to the moment of granting the favour. The suggestion made in

the present query is that a husband's expressions of regret for having married or his vain desires and hopes of being free of the marriage bond would be equivalent to his retracting consent. But his statements imply, rather, that he is admitting the existence of true matrimonial consent, which, to his mind, constitutes a true marriage, and that he regrets the obligations which he acknowledges as arising from the marriage. It may be that he has an interpretative intention in the sense that he would withdraw consent if he were able to be free of the marriage and its obligations. Such an intention is only hypothetical. Withdrawal of consent would require a positive act of the will.

## (2) AGREEMENT FOR CHILDREN TO ATTEND STATE SCHOOLS.

No doubts may be cast on the validity of the "sanatio" by reason of the parties' mutual agreement for the children to attend State schools.

The Local Ordinary's faculty to grant a sanatio is contained in the delegated powers of the Faculty Maior.

"Sanandi in radice, juxta regulas in Codice a can. 1138 ad can. 1141 statutas, matrimonia ob aliquod impedimentum, de quo supra (n. 22) nulliter contracta" (n. 23).

"Sanandi pariter in radice matrimonia mixta attentata coram magistratu civili vel ministro acatholico, dummodo moraliter certum sit partem acatholicam universae prolis tam natae quam nasciturae catholicam educationem non esse impediturum". n. 24.

The Ordinary may not exercise this faculty unless it is morally certain that the non-Catholic party will not impede the Catholic upbringing of the children, whether born or yet to be born. In the case under consideration, it is suggested, this condition was not fulfilled, so that the grant was invalid.

But the pastor had reasonable grounds for being morally certain on the point—the wife's insistence, the husband's begrudging consent, the fact that the Catholic upbringing of the children was in progress already. The Ordinary, in turn, had these facts as well as the pastor's assurances on which to base moral certainty. In any case, attendance at Catholic schools, however desirable, could not be described as absolutely necessary to Catholic upbringing. In many country districts it is out of the question for children to attend Catholic schools.

Even a fraudulent concealing of this agreement would not have the effect of invalidating the grant. It seems to be implied that the



children were in attendance at State schools at the time of the *sanatio* being granted—a fact which must have been known to the pastor. Even in the supposition that they had not yet commenced schooling, the pastor must have been aware of the likelihood of the husband's insistence on securing their attendance at State schools when the time should come. Nevertheless, the pastor would consider that he had reasonable grounds for being morally certain in the sense of the condition recorded above.

### (3) HUSBAND MISLED REGARDING WIFE'S INTENTIONS.

In order that his matrimonial consent would be nullified, it would have been necessary for the husband to place a condition on his consent that his wife abandon her religion. There is no evidence of such a condition. It is possible that he believed erroneously that his bride-to-be had given up her religion and that he was influenced thereby to enter upon the marriage. Perhaps, too, he would not have married her had he been aware of the real state of affairs. This intention not to marry would have been interpretative or hypothetical. Actually, he intended to marry the partner present beside him.

\* \* \* \*

## II. A MATRIMONIAL CASE—EFFECT OF *SANATIO* WHEN MARRIAGE REMAINS “NON CONSUMMATUM”.

Dear Rev. Sir,

A “*sanatio*” was granted in favour of A, a Catholic wife, and B, a non-Catholic husband. For some time A had entertained hopes of having her partner renew his consent in the ordinary way, especially as he had placed no obstacle to the Catholic upbringing of the children. As he was about to return home on Army leave and as he had expressed by letter his absolute unwillingness to renew consent, a “*sanatio*” was granted for A's peace of conscience.

Bearing out the old adage that there is many a slip 'twixt cup and lip, his leave was deferred at the last minute and he was transferred to another station. Meanwhile he formed an illicit association, as a result of which he has never returned to his wife.

Is there any hope of release from the marriage bond for A? Someone has said that the “*sanatio*” would not take effect until consummation of the revalidated marriage had been effected. Another claims that the “*sanatio*” was granted irregularly on account of the absence of B and is without effect.

Another query—If a well-instructed Catholic, knowing that the

canonical form is a requisite for validity, goes through the form of civil marriage, how can he be supposed to have given true matrimonial consent—such as is pre-supposed in granting a “sanatio”?

PETRUS.

### REPLY.

It is possible that there is a way open to A to seek a dissolution of her marriage, but neither of the reasons advanced in the query is valid.

(1) It is suggested that the “sanatio” would not take effect until the revalidated marriage had been consummated. There are no grounds for such an assertion. The “sanatio” may be granted in two ways. It may be granted in “forma gratiosa”, i.e., without any executor of the rescript being nominated. In this case the pastor’s office is simply to inform the petitioner that the concession has been granted. Such a “sanatio” takes effect immediately that it is granted by the competent authority. On the other hand it may be granted in “forma commissoria”, i.e., an executor of the rescript is nominated. The executor, e.g., the pastor, is entrusted with the office of executing the rescript, which takes effect when he discharges this commission. In either case the marriage has been constituted as a true and valid marriage before any physical consummation of the union, just as any other marriage is constituted as such by the consent of the parties, rightfully given (Canon 1081, 1).

(2) It is equally erroneous to suggest that the “sanatio” is invalid because the other party is absent or in ignorance of the concession. The dispensation from the obligation of renewing consent may be granted even if one or both of the parties be ignorant of it (Canon 1138, 3). The power of the competent authority to establish diriment impediments and prescribe a canonical form of marriage, likewise the power to relax these laws, is independent of the knowledge of these laws on the part of subjects or others. Moreover no injury is done to the absent party. He is convinced of the validity of his marriage, it may be assumed. He cannot complain because the Church relaxes her law in favour of her own member in order to give her grounds for a similar conviction.

It should be observed that a “sanatio” is sometimes granted when both parties are ignorant of the concession, e.g., when it is discovered that a marriage is invalid because the officiating priest was not qualified to assist at the marriage. No purpose is served by informing the

parties, while not inconsiderable embarrassment could arise for the parties or for the priest.

#### REVALIDATED UNION NOT CONSUMMATED.

There is a grain of truth, however, in the first reason advanced by PETRUS. Supposing that B is baptized, the marriage becomes sacramental, or "ratum," upon the "sanatio" being granted. Subsequent consummation is required in order that the marriage may be "ratum et consummatum". No doubt, the marriage of A comes within the power of the Supreme Pontiff to dissolve non-consummated marriages. This case does not seem to be considered explicitly by the recognised commentators. That is not surprising as a "sanatio" is usually granted in favour of a couple who wish to continue living as husband and wife. No information is available as to whether such a marriage would be dissolved by the Supreme Pontiff.

To clarify this point it should be added that revalidation of the marriage is effected at the moment of the sanatio being granted (*ex nunc*). By a legal fiction the canonical effects, e.g., legitimation, are understood to reach back to the beginning of the marriage, unless the contrary is stated (*ex tunc*). Plainly, a legal fiction cannot be employed to establish the marriage as valid or sacramental at any stage prior to the dispensation.

#### KNOWLEDGE OF NULLITY AND MATRIMONIAL CONSENT.

Canon 1085 states true canonical doctrine on this point. "*Scientia aut opinio nullitatis matrimonii consensum matrimoniale necessario non excludit*".

True matrimonial consent—required by the very nature of a sanatio—is consistent with knowledge that the marriage is invalid. The party in question is aware that her marriage performed by a civil registrar is invalid by reason of the law regarding canonical form. Nevertheless she may place a real act of the will consenting to the mutual rights and duties of matrimony. The ecclesiastical law renders her consent juridically ineffective but leaves intact in its physical entity her act of will. Her consciousness of this juridical invalidity does not necessarily exclude a true matrimonial consent for her dominant intention is to contract marriage. She is, perhaps, justifying or excusing her wrongful action or hoping that it will be rectified in the future. Her intention is to take a partner for life with all the implications of the married state, not to take a companion with whom she will live in a legalised state of concubinage.



It is substantially the same case when a party is conscious of a diriment impediment, e.g., consanguinity between cousins. The consent of the parties is juridically ineffective because they have been rendered ineligible to contract marriage by positive disposition of law. Their consent may be truly matrimonial, nevertheless, intact in its physical entity, insofar as they intend to take each other as husband and wife.

Knowledge of nullity does not *necessarily* exclude true matrimonial consent. But in some cases such knowledge could be the cause of making the act of the will not a true consent to matrimony. A party to a civil marriage, aware of its invalidity, might intend merely an external ceremony which will give legal recognition to the union. His true internal consent is not to matrimony but rather to concubinage.

JAMES CARROLL.

# Liturgy

## THE CEREMONY OF ORDINATION TO THE PRIESTHOOD.

### VESTING OF THE ORDINATI.

At the conclusion of the Preface, the Bishop sits; the cloth-of-gold mitre is placed on his head and the gremial veil over his knees. The candidates rise and approach the Bishop in pairs, but kneel before him one by one. The M.C. or one of the assistants makes sure that the portion of the stole which has been across the back of the newly ordained is free at the cincture so that the Bishop may conveniently bring it round the neck, to be crossed over the part which already extends from the left shoulder across the breast to the cincture. As the Bishop thus re-arranges the stole priest-wise on the candidate he says: *Accipe jugum Domini, etc.*, to which there is no response. Then the chaplains present the chasuble to the Bishop, who places it over the head of the priest with the words: *Accipe vestem sacerdotalem, etc.*, to which the ordinatus replies: *Deo gratias*. The front of the chasuble falls at length, while the back is folded so that it hangs about twelve inches from the shoulders: the strings are tied as usual. Each of the ordinati is vested with both stole and chasuble in turn. After the vesting, the ordinati return to their places in the sanctuary and kneel. The gremial and mitre are removed from the Bishop by the chaplains; and he stands to recite the prayer: *Deus sanctificationum, etc.*

### THE *VENI CREATOR* AND THE ANOINTING OF THE HANDS.

The Bishop, who has been standing without mitre, now kneels on a cushion before the faldstool, while the first chaplain removes the zucchetto: the book and bugia bearers take up their positions as during the Litanies. The Bishop intones the *Veni Creator*, which is immediately taken up by the choir. At the conclusion of the first verse of this hymn, he rises and sits on the faldstool. During the anointing of the hands, the hymn may be repeated if necessary (excluding the first and last verses). If there be no choir, the Bishop and his assistants recite the whole of the *Veni Creator*. As soon as the Bishop is seated, the first chaplain replaces the zucchetto and mitre; he then removes the ring and the glove from the right hand, while the second chaplain takes the glove from the left. The gloves are placed on a salver and the ring put back on the Bishop's hand: the M.C. presents a linen gremial with strings which are fastened to the corners of the faldstool. One of the assistants brings the oil of catechumens for the anointing of

the hands. The ordinati rise and advance to the Bishop, kneeling before him one by one for the anointing, each one holding for this ceremony his hands horizontal and touching, with the fingers close together. The Bishop dips his right thumb in the vessel of oil, which may conveniently be held by the second chaplain, and proceeds to anoint the hands of the first of the candidates. He does so in the form of a cross which is traced by two lines, one from the thumb of the right hand to the index finger of the left, and the other from the thumb of the left hand to the index finger of the right: he then anoints the palms all over. While anointing the hands, he says: *Consecrare et sanctificare, etc.*, making the sign of the Cross at the word *benedictionem*. The ordinatus replies *Amen*, and the Bishop proceeds without any blessing to say the following words of the Pontifical: *ut quaecumque, etc.*, to which is given the same response: *Amen*. The Bishop then closes the hands so that the right hand is placed over the left; and the first candidate makes way for the next, descending the steps of the Altar where an attendant awaits to bind his hands with the linen cloth, which is caught in the cincture. It is to be noted that the tips of the fingers should be left uncovered at the binding of the hands. When the Bishop has completed the anointing of the hands of all the candidates, he wipes the oil from his right thumb with a piece of cotton-wool or bread crumb. The M.C. now puts away the oil and presents the chalice containing wine and a little water, and over it the paten on which rests the host.

#### THE TRADITIO INSTRUMENTORUM.

The Bishop places the chalice on his knee, and the candidates come to kneel before him in succession to receive the instruments. Each touches the cup of the chalice with his two middle fingers and the paten and host with the index fingers, and he keeps them in that position while the Bishop recites the formula: *Accipe potestatem, etc.*, to which the ordinatus replies: *Amen*.

After receiving the chalice, etc., each of the candidates goes to the vicinity of the credence table, where an assistant removes the linen band from his hands and replaces it in the cincture. The hands of the new priests are washed in warm water, lemon and bread crumbs being used to help in the removal of the oil.

When the Bishop has presented the chalice to the last of the ordinati, the M.C. takes away the chalice; the first chaplain removes the ring; the acolytes kneel before the Bishop with a bowl of warm water, slices of lemon and bread crumbs and a medium sized towel, and he



cleanses the oil from his thumb and washes his hands. The linen gremial is taken from his knees, the gloves replaced by the chaplains on his right and left, and he receives again the episcopal ring. The second chaplain removes the mitre, and the Bishop rises to return to the Missal where he continues the Mass. Meanwhile the newly ordained, after washing their hands, go to the prie-dieux on the sanctuary where they kneel, forming a semi-circle, and receive back their candles. The book-bearer puts down the Pontifical and stands near the sedile; the bugia-bearer assists at the Missal as usual.

#### THE GOSPEL.

After reading the conclusion of the Gradual, etc., the Bishop comes to the centre of the Altar and recites the *Munda cor meum*, etc. The missal will be transferred to the gospel side by one of the Acolytes; the bugia-bearer crosses to the same side, and will take up his position on the extreme outside.

The ordinati stand as the Bishop begins the Gospel. The first chaplain goes to the credence table and brings the chalice to the Altar; the M.C. will bring the ciborium; where there are only a few ordinati (say not more than five or six) it will be more convenient to place the particles for their communion on the paten. The chaplain spreads the corporal as usual, but leaves the chalice still veiled on the epistle side: he has no occasion to wear the stole. At the end of the gospel, the chaplains assist the Bishop when he kisses the beginning of the sacred text, and the second chaplain brings the missal towards the tabernacle. If the office of the day requires the *Credo*, it is recited as usual.

(To be continued.)

\*

\*

\*

\*

#### QUERIES.

#### USE OF THE COMMUNION CLOTH—MANNER OF WEARING THE STOLE—ANNIVERSARY MASS FOR A DECEASED PRIEST.

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. Is there any need to have the communion cloth when the plate is used which was prescribed by the Holy See some years ago?
2. Is the stole worn crossed when the priest is vested in the alb, or is this position laid down for Mass only?
3. What formula should be taken from the Masses for the Dead on the occasion of the Anniversary of a Priest?

RUSTICUS.

## REPLY.

1. According to the decree of the S. Congregation of Sacraments (26th March, 1929: A.A.S. XXI, p. 631), both cloth and communion plate are to be used. "In the distribution of Holy Communion to the faithful, there should be used—besides the white cloth required by the rubrics of the Missal, the Ritual and the Ceremonial of Bishops—a plate made of silver or of other gold-plated metal." The reason for the communion plate is not to displace the cloth, but to be an additional precaution to safeguard the fragments of the sacred particles.

2. Whenever the Priest is vested in alb and stole, he wears the stole cross on front, the right portion over the left; and this is observed not only at Mass but on other occasions, e.g., solemn Benediction, Processions, etc. A Bishop does not cross the stole, because he wears the pectoral cross on his breast, but if for some reason the pectoral cross were not available, he would do so. When wearing the stole over the surplice, both ends hang loose and the stole is not crossed.

3. The Mass to be taken on the anniversary of the death of a Priest is that which is given as the first Mass for the Commemoration of All Souls, with the Collect *pro defuncto sacerdote*. The rubric which follows the third Mass for All Souls' day in the Missal gives this rule for a deceased Pope and adds: *Idem servatur pro defunctis Cardinalibus, Episcopis et Sacerdotibus cum Orationibus propriis . . . ut infra inter Orationes diversas*.

\*

\*

\*

\*

NEWLY MARRIED COUPLE IN SANCTUARY DURING  
NUPTIAL MASS—POSITION OF MISSAL WHEN  
CLOSED AFTER THE LAST GOSPEL.

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. I have been informed that the Bridegroom and Bride are not allowed within the sanctuary for the Nuptial Mass. Is this correct?

2. When the last gospel is read from the Missal, should the leaves face the tabernacle, when the book is closed?

CHAPLAIN.

## REPLY.

1. Almost all the writers on the rubrics forbid the presence of the Bridegroom and Bride in the sanctuary during the Mass; and they most probably base their teaching on the decrees of the S.C.R. such as 1258, ad 2, and 1288, which forbid the presence of lay persons, except royalty within the sanctuary during any liturgical function. However, the Baltimore Ritual, which is extensively used in this country, does allow

the newly-wedded within the sanctuary. "After this (i.e., the prayer *Respice*) the Mass pro *Sponso et Sponsa* is said in the presence of the newly married couple. (They may kneel at the Altar rail or on kneeling stools within the sanctuary)" (p. 215). We believe this practice is very general in Australia, and where it is observed may be considered as sanctioned by custom.

2. The rubrics of the Missal do not prescribe how the Missal is to be closed; and the authorities differ on the point. For example, Wapelhorst O.S.B. says the leaves face towards the tabernacle: "*non osculatur missale . . . sed claudit illud ita ut apertura versa sit ad medium altaris*" (p. 142, n. 122). On the other hand, Martinucci says that the Missal is closed with the right hand, thus implying that the leaves should be away from the tabernacle—"manu dextera librum claudit" (Lib. I, tit. II—Cap. III, Art. II, n. 141), *In dubio possidet libertas*, but the second method appears to us the more obvious and, moreover, the right hand, if free, is used for an action in the liturgy.

\* \* \* \*

#### A SODALITY MATTER.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Certain Religious have a Sodality of the Children of Mary established in their boarding schools. The rules do not indicate that this sodality is affiliated to the Prima-Primaria, and the indulgences set down for the sodalists are not so generous as those conceded to affiliated sodalities. Twice a month there are plenary indulgences available on conditions including a visit to the oratory of the Religious. Sodality therefore appear to be at a disadvantage especially when, after leaving school, this visit is no longer possible. To gain the full advantages of the Prima-Primaria should these young ladies be formally admitted to the affiliated sodalities, and if so under what conditions?

DIRECTOR.

#### REPLY.

We confess to have laboured under no slight confusion about the different sodalities which go under the name, official or unofficial, of "Children of Mary". It seems to us that at least two are met with in the experience of "DIRECTOR", one that which is designated as the Prima-Primaria, and the other, possibly, the Children of Mary of the Sacred Heart. There is also a third very widely spread Sodality of Children of Mary, commonly so called, whose official title would be the Confraternity of the Immaculate Conception. These three Sodality are not one and the same, and membership of one does not necessarily include a participation in the spiritual privileges of the others.

The Prima-Primaria or, to call it by the correct name, the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin Mary, was founded at Rome in the Roman College of the Jesuit Fathers in 1563. It was a sodality for young men, pupils of the Jesuits, and was placed under the protection of the Blessed Virgin, its object being personal perfection in virtue and study, as well as works of charity and zeal for souls. As early as 1569 a division was necessary on account of the large number of members. The older members formed one sodality which met in the college church, which bore the title of the Annunciation, and thus it was called the Primary Sodality (Prima-Primaria) of the Annunciation. The Sodality soon spread to other educational establishments conducted by the Fathers of the Society. Pope Benectict XIV in 1751 granted the General of the Jesuits authority to unite with the Prima-Primaria, and so to share in all its indulgences, other sodalities of either sex which had been erected in Jesuit churches: this privilege was afterwards extended by Pope Leo XII in 1825 to include sodalities which existed in churches other than those of the Jesuits. In brief, then, the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin is under the auspices of the Jesuit Fathers, who admit other sodalities to a share in the privileges of the Prima-Primaria. It was originally for men, but persons of both sexes have for a long time been eligible for membership. It is met with very frequently in Australasia.

Another Sodality of the Blessed Virign was founded by St. Madeline Sophie Barat, and its members are known as Children of Mary of the Sacred Heart. It flourishes in the Schools of the Religious of the Sacred Heart, and we are given to understand is affiliated to the Prima-Primaria.

Well known also is the Confraternity under the title of the Immaculate Conception which has adopted the Miraculous Medal as its badge and its members, commonly called Children of Mary, wear the medal attached to a blue ribbon. This Sodality is under the protection of the Congregation of the Mission, and in 1847 M. Etienne, their Superior General, obtained from Pope Pius IX. the privileges which were attached to the Sodality established at Rome by the Jesuits for their students.

It seems that these three Sodalities of similar nature and scope, though distinct bodies, have much the same spiritual privileges—those granted to the most ancient of the Prima-Primaria.

To answer our correspondent's question: Whether the young lady, who was enrolled in a Sodality of the Children of Mary while at school,



gains the Indulgences of the Prima-Primaria depends on whether the School Sodality has secured affiliation with the Prima-Primaria—and DIRECTOR says there is no statement in the Rules to the effect that it is so affiliated. We would not, however, take the absence of such a statement as definite proof that there is no affiliation; and would suggest enquiries from those Religious who sponsor the Sodality. It may be noted further that enrolment in one Sodality does not mean that a person becomes a member of another which is a different organisation, even though their aims be similar and their rules much alike. Thus the young lady in our question who belongs, let us say, to the Children of Mary of the Sacred Heart, would not be *ipso facto* a member of the Confraternity of the Immaculate Conception. She would miss the Indulgences attached to attendance of meetings of her own Sodality and those which prescribe a visit to the Oratory of the Religious. She could, however, gain those spiritual favours which are gained by private exercises of piety. If she wishes to join the local Sodality, she must go through the usual procedure laid down for the admittance of new members: and for the sake of the advantages of common effort which are the purpose of sodalities, this course would suggest itself, in the case of one who is now unable to partake in the community exercises of the Sodality in which she had been enrolled. There is no objection to membership of more than one sodality, provided they are not Third Orders.

\*

\*

\*

\*

#### DRAPING OF THE ALTAR FOR OFFICE OF THE DEAD.

Dear Rev. Sir,

On those occasions when the Office and Mass of the Dead are celebrated, is it lawful to drape the Altar in drapings of black or purple?

CELEBRANS.

#### REPLY.

If the Blessed Sacrament is reserved at the Altar the colour of any drapings must be violet, and the only ones permissible are the tabernacle veil and the antependium (*S.C.R.* 3562). If the Blessed Sacrament is not reserved, there will be no tabernacle veil, and the antependium will be the colour of the Mass—black. Custom also may permit a cover on the missal stand (violet or black, as the case may be). No other drapings are allowed; thus the candle sticks should not be covered with violet (*S.C.R.* 3201, ad 10) nor with black. The use of black candle sticks made of wood has no liturgical sanction. J.M.

# Homiletics

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR MEN—III. *REVELATION.*

Faith is the belief of certain doctrines on the authority of God Who has revealed them. Before a man can make an act of faith in what God has revealed, obviously he must be convinced that there is a God, and that God has made a revelation to us.

That God exists is proved by arguments so clear and so easily grasped that no man who thinks at all can remain unconvinced. There will, of course, always be those, who blinded by pride, prejudice or passion, persist in proclaiming their atheism. There are none so blind as those who will not see. But the great multitude of men, now as in every age, accepts the existence of God as an incontrovertible fact. Many do not permit this intellectual conviction to have any practical effect upon their lives; many ignore God, but few deny Him.

But if it is clear to man's unguided reason that there is a Supreme Being, Who put us in this world, reason has not been able to tell us much about Him, or why He put us here, nor to enlighten us as to what He expects of us, or what, if anything, follows this life. These surely are the most vital things that man needs to know: "Why am I here?" "What must I do?" "What awaits me hereafter?" And yet man's groping intellect has, through the ages, returned to these all-important questions, answers so widely different, so wildly contradictory, so utterly confused as to provoke laughter, did it not rather move to tears.

Amongst the peoples of antiquity the grossest errors prevailed. The Divine Power in which they believed was divided, they fancied, amongst two or even many more gods. Their gods were at feud with one another, they were credited with indulging in lying, injustice, and every disgraceful baseness, and they were offered a worship which was in some cases nothing else but public immorality. The moral standards of peoples who held such beliefs can easily be imagined. With regard to the future life, there was a universal belief in survival after death, but for the Greeks and Romans the next life was much less happy and desirable than this, while for other less civilised peoples it was an endless career of low sensual debauchery. Even the greatest thinkers held views widely differing in theology, and authorising many perversions in morals.

The truth is the bulk of mankind has neither the leisure nor the mental equipment to think out for themselves the truth of religion, nor

indeed the inclination to do so. Even those who are thus qualified and earnest seekers after truth, can never be sure that they have found it, nor impose their beliefs upon others, being but men, and being men liable to error.

Now God to plan the world must be all-wise, and being all-wise must have foreseen the deplorable confusion that men would get into in their endeavour to know and serve Him. Being all-good, as He must be to have wished us to exist and share His happiness in existing, surely He could not have wished such a tragic state of ignorance and error to persist. Lastly the all-mighty God Who made the mind of man to think, and Who gave men the power to communicate with one another would find no difficulty in communicating the truth to men.

We should expect, in other words, that God would make a revelation of Himself and His purposes in making the world—that He would draw back the veil, and show men the truth they sought in vain by the light of reason. Surely God would Himself teach us with authority that none could gainsay, the answer to those all-important questions: “Why are we here?” “What must we do?” “What awaits us after this life?”

In the course of history many men have claimed to be the instruments of this revelation. In every age men have come forward—they are still doing so—to proclaim that God has given them the vital message to deliver to men. Many of these prophets have been exposed as impostors and racketeers; multitudes are obviously deluded cranks. Many have been laughed off the stage; some have numbered their followers in millions. Many have taught and their teachings were forgotten almost as soon as they ceased to speak; some have proclaimed doctrines that have endured for centuries.

But it is one thing to claim divine authority, another to prove that claim. If God did make a revelation, He would have made it in vain, unless He provided means whereby man might know for sure that it *was* His revelation. Otherwise it would become just another religious teaching which might be true, or might be mistaken. If God has indeed sent a messenger to teach men, He must provide that messenger with unimpeachable credentials whereby men may know that he is indeed sent of God. Otherwise men would see in him just another self-styled prophet, maybe inspired, maybe deluded: they might honestly believe him, they might honestly doubt him. Men would still not know for certain what they must believe: an ambassador without credentials can command no credit.

How could a bearer of revelation prove his revelation genuine? What proof of divine authority could God's messenger produce? We should expect, naturally, that the great prophet would be a man of outstanding personality; we would expect him to practise what he preached. It is not impossible that an insignificant man, even that an evil man, could on occasions, speak inspired truth, but it is unthinkable that God would commit the great revelation to any but a man of pre-eminent character and complete integrity. But more than this would be needed. He must be able to shock people into realising that here is something super-human: he must do things that no mere man can do: he must say things that no mere man can know.

The modern sceptic, of course, scoffs at the idea of miracles. Primitive ignorant peoples, he says, may be taken in by this miracle nonsense, but surely in this enlightened scientific age no one seriously believes in them. To which we may reply that a great many intelligent people do believe in them, or at least are open to conviction about them. Many reputed miracles no doubt are myths, many more deliberate frauds, but that only proves the necessity for careful and exhaustive examination of the evidence of any alleged miracle. To make a sweeping denial of their possibility is unscientific, and, as a matter of fact, betrays that the scoffer is himself sadly out of date. In the nineteenth century Science was sure it knew all the answers, but scientists to-day willingly confess the limitations of human knowledge, and admit their conviction that forces exist outside and beyond what has been discovered of the Universe. And indeed if God exists, the Creator of the Universe, the Legislator Who formulated the laws which it obeys, then that God would find no difficulty in suspending the laws which He has made.

But others object: Is it necessary to invoke divine power to explain so-called miracles? Cannot these be attributed to the operation of natural laws not yet discovered? After all a few centuries ago it would have been considered miraculous for man to fly, or to send his voice around the world, yet these are commonplace events to-day. The world, they say, is full of miracles, yet these are the work not of God but of human ingenuity. May not all miracles be thus explained as the acts of men of genius, enjoying knowledge far in advance of their contemporaries, and able to employ merely natural forces to bring about startling results? It, of course, cannot be denied that men of advanced knowledge may have been able to palm off to the ignorant and superstitious merely natural phenomena as miraculous interpositions of the



unseen. But we are concerned with events that cannot thus be explained. And here we must remember that an event that can be brought about by natural forces or by scientific apparatus might in different circumstances be explainable only by supernatural power. It may be miraculous not in what is done, but in the way it is done. For instance, we now know that by means of atom-splitting, one substance may be changed into another, and lead, for example, be made into gold. But if a man were able to produce such a result without using any scientific apparatus but simply by waving a wand, that could only be by some power above what is natural. Some diseases once always fatal can now be cured by the sulfa drugs. But if a man were able, previous to the invention of those drugs, to cure patients of those diseases, instantly restoring them to robust health by a word, such a happening could not be explained by natural forces. Beyond such miracles we may imagine others in which what is done is itself impossible to natural means. However much medical science advances, there is no hope that doctors will ever be able to restore life to a body dead and putrified. If a man were to call such a corpse from the grave back to life he would be showing a power that we know to be beyond the natural.

It boils down to this: we do not know all that natural forces can do, nor all that scientists may yet be able to do, but we do know quite certainly some of the things they cannot do. We do not know how much the strongest man in the world can lift, but we do know that he cannot lift the "Queen Mary." And it is the same with prophecy. We do not know if there is anything in telepathy, or if some may be gifted with power to read the minds of others. But we do know that no man, however naturally gifted he may be, can know the thoughts and predict the free actions of men not even living at the time he speaks. If a man displays such knowledge of the future, and the future event bears out his prediction, we can only conclude that he is in touch with supernatural powers.

If a man, claiming to speak on behalf of God, performs an act that is completely beyond the power of man, does something only God can do, then that man either is God, or God is backing him up. If a man, claiming to be God's messenger, supports his claim by revealing future events that can be known only to God, then that man either is God, or God is testifying to the truth of his claim. God, Truth itself, cannot Himself lie; neither can He make Himself party to a lie by lending His almighty power, or His all-seeing knowledge to a fraud.

If then an alleged Divine Messenger, being himself superior to his

fellow-men by his incomparable character and immaculate integrity of life, can produce miracles and prophecies to support his claims, then he must be accepted, and his doctrines recognised as the Word of God. All this, however, is in the realm of theory. The practical question now arises: Has any one of these so-called divine messengers ever, in point of fact, worked miracles or uttered prophecies that were verified by events?

At first sight the prospect of such an investigation would fill the seeker after truth with despair. A lifetime would not suffice for the task. But we need not delve into the legendary stories of Buddha, nor pore over the history of Mahomed. We need not search learned tomes for references to Zoroaster nor wade through the pamphlets of Judge Rutherford. From history there shines like a dazzling light the name of Christ. Our civilization is built around His religion, the very years of our era are numbered from His birth. No other figure has ever exercised a tiny fraction of the influence that is Christ's. World literature is permeated with Him, an endless flood of books about Him pour from the presses. He is a subject of unfailing interest to every generation and to every people. Mahomedanism rejects His doctrines but ranks Him as a major prophet. Modern Jews reckon Him the greatest of the Sons of Judah. Countless millions of His followers revere Him as the Son of God. The Church He founded is unique in history in its permanence, its unfailing vitality, its universal sway.

If we are seeking a divine revelation, we cannot ignore the Christian religion. If we are investigating the claims of alleged messengers from God, we must begin with Christ. Perhaps it will not be necessary to go further. Our task then is to investigate Christ, to see, first, if he made claim to speak for God; then, to see if he produced proof of his authority so to speak. This we must leave till another time.

To re-capitulate what has been discussed in the present talk: We came to these conclusions:

*First*—Man's reason, though convinced of God's existence, has not been able to establish much more about Him, or His designs for men, or His demands upon them.

*Second*—God, knowing man's confusion, would most likely make a communication to men, a revelation of a true religion.

*Third*—A divine messenger could, and indeed must, prove his authority, his right to speak to men for God. This could be most conclusively done by miracles and prophecy.

*Fourth*—The most outstanding religious teacher in history was Christ. We must first investigate Him.

W. BAKER.

# Notes

That a bookbinder's error about the year 100 A.D. was responsible for reversing the order of Chapters 5 and 6 of the Fourth Gospel, and that, by rectifying this error, we solve various difficulties and problems in the Gospel text, and prove that Our Lord's public ministry lasted two years, is a contention strongly urged in recent times, and favourably received by many biblical students. It may be worth while to examine the reasons urged to support this thesis.

It is frankly admitted that there is no external evidence whatever to support this view. "The two Chapters (5 and 6) are found in their traditional order in all the codices and in all the versions. This order underlies the text of Origen and is patently that followed by Irenaeus . . . . If the order thus universally followed is erroneous, the misplacement must go back to the very archetype of the fourth Gospel".

But strong internal evidence (it is urged) goes to show that such misplacement must have occurred, even though all tradition of it (as of some primeval earthquake) has vanished. The evidence in general runs thus:

The sequence of Chapters 4 to 7 as they now stand is less natural and convincing than if we read them in order 4-6-5-7. And this new arrangement smoothes away difficulties hitherto insoluble, including that of the unnamed festival of 5<sup>1</sup>. "The proposed inversion makes the narrative run more smoothly, gives it greater point, removes existing difficulties".

## ARGUMENTS.

The arguments more in detail are these:—

1. In the present order there is a very awkward juncture or sequence between Chapters 5 and 6, which is removed by placing Chapter 6 immediately after Chapter 4.

Chapter 6 opens thus: "After these things Jesus went away over the Sea of Galilee". Now at the end of Chapter 5 Our Lord is in Jerusalem. Obviously it is very abrupt and unnatural to state of one who has just been teaching in Jerusalem that "He then went away across the Sea of Galilee". But if Chapter 6 follows 4, the words are quite natural, since at the end of 4 Our Lord is in Galilee. Just as it is quite natural to say of a man who is in Sydney, "he went across the harbour to Manly"; but to say this of a man in Melbourne, without first mentioning his departure to New South Wales, would sound very strange.

2. Further, Chapter 7 follows more naturally after 5.

Chapter 7 begins: "After these things Jesus walked in Galilee for He would not walk in Judaea, because the Jews sought to kill Him". In the new order this gives the reason why Christ left Jerusalem and Judaea and worked in Galilee, viz., to avoid the murderous designs of the Jews in the Capital.

3. That the Jews sought to kill Our Lord is told in 5<sup>18</sup>.

In the new order of Chapters the statement 7<sup>1</sup> that this was the reason for Jesus leaving Jerusalem comes very appositely after Chapter 5 at the close of the feast at which the Jews were recorded to have sought means to achieve His death.

4. Placing Chapter 5 after 6 solves the age-old problem of the feast referred to in 5<sup>1</sup>. For then it is simply a reference back to the Passover mentioned by name in 6<sup>4</sup> as near at hand. This demands that the Greek article be retained in 5<sup>1</sup> "*the* feast",—a reading which has good manuscript authority.

5. Chronological considerations favour the sequence 6-5.

Our Lord's words in John 5<sup>35</sup>, "He *was* the lamp burning and shining, and you were willing for a while to rejoice in his light", imply that John the Baptist was dead. But we know from the Synoptics that he was killed shortly before the Passover (referred to in John 6<sup>4</sup>) and the multiplication of loaves, whereas Our Lord's words in 5<sup>35</sup> were spoken at Jerusalem several months (perhaps a year) earlier. If Chapter 5 follows 6 of course the difficulty disappears.

6. Moreover at the feast of Tabernacles the words of Christ 7<sup>20-23</sup>, "Why seek you to kill me?" etc., clearly refer to the Bethesda miracle of Chapter 5.

As the chapters stand this allusion is to events of at least a year or more earlier: in the new order the reference is to the feast of the Passover, only a few months before, in the same year.

7. Finally in John 6<sup>14</sup> the crowds (after the miracle near the Lake of Galilee) cried, "This is of a truth the prophet that is to come into the world"—a reference to the great prophet foretold by Moses Deuter. 18<sup>18</sup>.

In Chapter 5<sup>45-47</sup> Jesus appeals to the witness rendered to Him by Moses, "If you did believe Moses you would believe Me; for he wrote of Me".

In the new order of chapters Jesus makes His appeal to Moses shortly after the men of Galilee had professed their faith in Him as the prophet foretold by Moses: and so His appeal has greater force.



Those learned in the law should recognize Him who was foretold in the Law, as He had already been recognized by the crowds of Galilee.

#### COMMENT.

These are arguments which by their cumulative effect would seem to justify the placing of Chapter 5 after 6, in spite of all the external and traditional evidence to the contrary.

To tamper with an ancient traditional text, especially a Gospel text, accepted and witnessed to by all the MSS and church writers is obviously a serious business, not to be undertaken without very strong and compelling reasons. Do the arguments set forth above supply such reasons? Let us weigh them in turn.

1. Of the three junctures (or sequences) between Chapters 4, 5, 6, 7, the only one (in the present order) that causes trouble is that between 5 and 6.

The opening words of 6<sup>1</sup> ("Jesus crosses the Sea of Galilee") seem very abrupt coming after the Chapter 5 where Jesus is in Jerusalem.

But first we must remember that John presupposes the Synoptic narratives and passes over at this point a long series of events of the Galilean Ministry already described by St. Luke (6<sup>1</sup> to 9<sup>18</sup>) and the other Synoptics, and hence he presupposes Christ's departure for Galilee after the events of Chapter 5.

2. Secondly: is the new sequence produced by placing 7 after 5 much less abrupt? For in that case also John's opening words *presuppose* that Christ has left Jerusalem for Galilee. 7<sup>1</sup> says: "After these things Jesus walked (i.e., went about teaching) in Galilee, for He would not walk in Judaea because the Jews sought to kill Him".

Remark this is not a statement that Jesus went away from Jerusalem to Galilee. The word used (*peripatein*) means to move about in (or live) in a place, *not* to set out for another place.

In the present order (6-7) the remark is quite natural. "After this (His discourse at Capharnaum) Jesus went about (teaching) in Galilee: He would not do so in Judaea (whither He might have been expected to go for the Passover which was at hand, 6<sup>4</sup>)—because the Jews in Jerusalem had designs on His life". These last words give the reason, not for Christ's return to Galilee (which, I repeat, John obviously presupposes; of that journey, as of the long Galilean Ministry he says nothing) but they explain why Christ remained in Galilee instead of going up to

Jerusalem (for the Passover) and working there.

In the proposed new order Jesus, at the beginning of Chapter 7 is found in Galilee *immediately* after His visit to Jerusalem. John can *not* be taking for granted a series of events as already told by the Synoptics, and so one would naturally expect some mention of Christ's departure from Jerusalem. Whereas in the sequence 5-6 John does presuppose a fairly long Galilean Ministry, after which he states (6<sup>1</sup>) that Jesus (being in Galilee) went across the Lake.

It is hardly a satisfactory remedy for the seemingly abrupt opening of 6<sup>1</sup> (after 5) to remove Chapter 7 from its present position (after 6) where it suits perfectly, and place it after 5, forming a new juncture that is also abrupt, even if somewhat less so than the other.

3. Since as we have said the words in 7<sup>1</sup> explain *not* why Christ left Jerusalem, but why He remained in Galilee, there is no reason for considering them specially apposite if placed just after Chapter 5. The danger to His life in Jerusalem lasted all during the ministry in Galilee.

It is true that the Jews' determination to kill Our Lord is first mentioned in 5<sup>18</sup> where two reasons are given: His 'breaking the Sabbath' and His claiming equality with God. But during the months that followed we may be sure that reports from Galilee of Christ's teaching and of His miracles even on the Sabbath, reached Jerusalem and served to intensify his enemies' resolve to be rid of Him. Hence it is not surprising that (according to the present order of chapters) a year or so after the Bethesda miracle it is stated (7<sup>1</sup>) that Jesus remained in Galilee because of the threat against His life in Jerusalem. When He did at last go up to the city after a long period spent in Galilee and neighbourhood, He deliberately faced that threat and met His doom.

4. The new order of chapters solves the problem of the unnamed feast of 5<sup>1</sup> by making it simply a reference back to the Passover mentioned in 6<sup>4</sup>. This reference—it is said—is quite in keeping with John's usage. Thus after mentioning the Pasch by name in 2<sup>13</sup> he afterwards refers to it as "the feast". And so in several other places.

It will help to throw light on St. John's usage if we collect the passages in which he thus refers back to a feast already mentioned, and then the places in which he announces the approach or celebration of a new festival.

## A

- 2<sup>23</sup> When He was in Jerusalem for the feast of Passover  
 4<sup>45</sup> the Galileans had seen all He had done at the feast.  
 7<sup>8</sup> you go up to the feast (Tabernacles named in 7<sup>2</sup>)  
 10 his brethren had gone up to the feast  
 14 when the feast was half over  
 11<sup>56</sup> what do you think that he is not coming to the feast" (Pass-  
 over announced in 11<sup>55</sup>.)  
 So again 12<sup>12-20</sup> 13<sup>29</sup>.

## B

Six passages announcing a festival (including 5<sup>1</sup>).

- 2<sup>13</sup> the Passover of the Jews was at hand.  
 5<sup>1</sup> After this there was a feast (or the feast) of the Jews.  
 6<sup>4</sup> the Passover, the feast of the Jews was at hand  
 7<sup>2</sup> the feast of the Jews, Tabernacles was at hand  
 10<sup>22</sup> the Dedication (feast) took place in Jerusalem  
 11<sup>55</sup> The Passover of the Jews was at hand.

The difference of usage in the two lists is obvious. In the first list where a reference is made to a feast already named, John says simply "the feast", without a verbal predicate, and the words "of the Jews" never occur.

But in the second list when announcing the approach or celebration of a festival, there is a definite statement ("was near", or "took place") and the words "of the Jews" are always added (except 10<sup>22</sup> Dedication, where "in Jerusalem" occurs). Does it not seem clear that the sentence in 5<sup>1</sup> "after this there was a feast *of the Jews*" belongs to the second series and is the announcement of the approach of a hitherto unnamed festival? Hence the *usage* of St. John seems definitely opposed to taking 5<sup>1</sup> as a mere reference back to the Passover of 6<sup>4</sup>.

5. Do the words of Our Lord in John 6<sup>35</sup> "John the Baptist was a burning and shining light" imply that John the Baptist was already *dead*, which would involve a chronological discrepancy with the Synoptics? Many commentators hold they need only imply his imprisonment; so Knabenbauer, Durand, Lepicier, Westcott, Plummer, etc.

But it is urged that this is unsatisfactory since his disciples still had access to John in prison, and by his "preaching" before Herod he still continued to give testimony to the Truth and so was still "a burning and shining light".

But surely the mere fact that his few disciples had access to John in the grim fortress of Machaerus and that John had private interviews with Herod Antipas (Mark 6<sup>20</sup>; it is nowhere stated that John *preached* before him) do not constitute John "a burning and shining light"—as he was when preaching to the whole world and baptising at the Jordan? More literally Our Lord's words are "He was the burning and shining lamp".

Now it is worth noting that Our Lord said (Luke 11<sup>33</sup>) "No one lights a lamp (*luchnos*—the word used in John 5<sup>35</sup> of John Baptist) and puts it into a cellar or under a bushel-measure, but upon the lampstand that they who enter may see the light". To prevent the light from shining usefully, it need not be extinguished: men need only place it in a cellar or in a dungeon such as now held the Baptist.

6. Our Lord's words at the feast of Tabernacles 7<sup>20-23</sup> referring to the Bethesda cure seem in the present order to be uttered a long time (a year or more) after that event—whereas if Chapter 7 follows 5 they refer back to the Passover of the same year. (Dr. Moffatt actually places the whole section 7<sup>15-24</sup> at end of Chapter 5 with the confident remark "Restoring this passage to its original position in the Gospel").

Now if we remember that (according to present order) this is Our Lord's first visit to Jerusalem since the miracle at the pool of Bethesda (over a year earlier), and that this miracle made a very deep impression especially as it was wrought on the Sabbath, it will hardly seem strange that when Jesus next appears in Jerusalem, He should refer to the miracle and the stir it caused, as still fresh in the minds of His hearers.

If a distinguished visitor came to Sydney and performed some striking action that drew public attention (e.g. gave a remarkable concert or piano recital) it would not seem strange that coming back a year or so later he referred to his former visit and concert and the welcome he received. In Our Lord's case it was the very opposite of a welcome. His kindly action stirred up bitter, even murderous hostility. Hatred has a long memory! We may add that the words of the brethren (7<sup>3-5</sup>) urging Our Lord to go up to Jerusalem for the Feast of Tabernacles and show Himself publicly and work miracles in the capital city seem more intelligible if Christ has been a long time absent from Jerusalem, than if He had been there at the recent Passover of this same year and had actu-



ally worked there a very striking miracle which had drawn marked public attention. How could they in that case use the words "Nobody is content to act in secret if he wishes to make himself known at large" (7<sup>4</sup>) (Knox).

7. If the acclamation of the Galilean crowd (6<sup>14</sup>) saluting Christ as the Prophet foretold by Moses had taken place in Jerusalem under the eyes of the Pharisees, one might understand how Our Lord's direct appeal to Moses as His witness (5<sup>45</sup>) would thereby be strengthened. But since this acclamation took place far away to the North, on the distant shore of Lake Galilee, it is difficult to see how the attitude of the people there could affect the Jews in Jerusalem when Our Lord accused them of rejecting the testimony of Moses. If any connection is to be sought between the two passages, one would think that Our Lord's appeal to Moses as His witness would suggest the recognition of Him by the people as the Great Prophet, not *vice versa*. And this might seem more probable since Galileans returning from the feast in Jerusalem would remember and report Our Lord's startling words, "Moses wrote about Me" (5<sup>46</sup>): and so they might influence the crowd after the miraculous multiplication of food to cry out "This is indeed the Prophet who is to come into the world" (6<sup>14</sup>), even though Our Lord's words in Jerusalem had been spoken many months earlier. So in 4<sup>45</sup> we are told that the Galileans received Our Lord because they had seen all He had done in Jerusalem during the Feast (Passover) for they also had gone to the feast.

### CONCLUSION.

I have now discussed all the arguments used to support the view that Chapter 5 has been misplaced. And I think it will be seen that they are not conclusive and do not justify the drastic step of altering the present order against the evidence of all MSS, versions and citations in the Fathers? Those who advocate the change admit that the misplacement must have taken place in the very archetype itself; and try to show by making surmises as to the size of a codex page and the number of lines it would contain and such details, how a binder's error in making up the first codex would account for the accidental misplacing of Chapter 5.

Into the details of this ingenious and purely conjectural hypothesis we need not enter. A recent work (*The Original Order and Chap-*

*ters of St. John's Gospel.* By F. R. Hoare. B.O.W. 1944) makes far more drastic proposals for re-arranging St. John's Gospel. Mr. Hoare divides up the Gospel into many fragments, which he repieces together in a new sequence, which it would seem gives us, at long last, the Fourth Gospel in the original order intended by the Great Evangelist! One point only will I emphasize; Mr. Hoare's rearrangement after long and minute study of the text, does *not* allow for that inversion of Chapters 5-6 which we have been discussing above, and for which some ardent supporters think the arguments so strong that they regard it as certain!

The suggestion that a binder's error caused the transposition of Chapters 5 and 6 leads to some reflections. Would neither St. John nor his amanuensis have noticed it? Can we imagine the Evangelist sending forth this precious Book to the Christian world with such a glaring misplacement of the order in which he wrote or dictated it? Are we to suppose that only one copy was produced for publication? If several copies, did the binders all conspire to make the same blunder? And once made how is it that the world had to wait long centuries before it was discovered? Although we now know that the codex form (as distinguished from the roll or volumen) was in use amongst Christians in Egypt as early as the 2nd Century, it is an assumption that the archetype of the fourth Gospel was in codex form—or indeed that this form was in use at all in Asia Minor (where St. John was living).

Finally, I may add (though the purpose of this paper is not to set forth proofs of a three year's public ministry) that Father Edmund Power, S.J., on quite other grounds comes to the conclusion that the "balance of proof seems decidedly in favour of a three years' Ministry". He assigns Our Lord's cleansing of the Temple (John 2) and the first Pasch to 30 A.D. and the Crucifixion to the 3rd April, 33 A.D. (*Biblica*, 1928, Page 277).

So also Father Lattey, S.J., in *Westminster Version*, Vol. II, 2nd Edition, page LXVII, note; and on Page 302, Father Corbishley, S.J., states reasons for this view and cites Dr. Fotheringham as favouring it.

All this, of course, implies four Passovers in our Lord's public life and excludes the hypothesis that the feast of 5<sup>1</sup> is identical with the Passover of 6<sup>4</sup>.

ALBERT POWER, S.J.

In an audience given to the delegates of the Society of Jesus assembled last year for their General Chapter, the Holy Father reiterated the necessity of adhering to the teachings of St. Thomas. He spoke explicitly of the "new theology" movement and of the dangers inherent in its approach to Divine Revelation and to the teachings of the Church. "At quod immutabile est, nemo turbet et moveat. Plura dicta sunt at non satis explorata ratione 'de nova theologia' quae cum universis semper volventibus rebus, una volvatur, semper itura numquam perventura. Si talis opinio amplectanda esse videatur, quid fiet de numquam immutandis catholicis dogmatibus, quid de fidei unitate et stabilitate?" *A.A.S.*, Vol. XXXVIII. p. 385.

In the latest number of *Angelicum* to hand (Dec. 1946), R. Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., writes an illuminating article on the "new theology" movement. Under the title "*La nouvelle théologie, où va-t-elle?*" he shows that this movement is in reality modernistic and based on a subjective definition of truth. He disclaims any thought of being an alarmist and writes to direct attention to the dangers of "new theology", "C'est une strict obligation de conscience pour les théologiens traditionnels de répondre. Autrement ils manquent gravement à leur devoir, et ils devront en rendre compte devant Dieu". (p. 135.)

France is the home of this theological movement and its protagonists are extremely active. For some years past typewritten matter has been distributed among the clergy, seminarists and Catholic intellectuals which propounds false philosophical principles and even fantastic teachings especially on the matter of Original sin and the Real Presence. It is a first principle of the "new theology" that if a doctrine is not *actual*, it is not true. A doctrine is *actual*, if it conforms with and satisfies the requirements of life, which is always evolving. Dogma is not considered from the viewpoint of infused faith and as interpreted by the Church but from the view-point of Hegelian evolutionism; dogma is never immutable, it is always *in fieri*. Because of this false notion of truth, the "new theology" would change not only the methods of teaching theology but theology itself.

The main cause of these unfortunate tendencies in France is attributed to the attendance of clerics at the secular Universities. Little by little some of them have come to accept the idealist views and methods of their masters and to share with them a contempt for scholastic theology.

In recent years there have been books and articles which show an effect of the "new theology" in the bitterness with which these attack the revival of the teachings of St. Thomas. One such work, *Conversion et grâce chez S. Thomas d'Aquin* by P. Henri Bouillard, claims that modern thought has abandoned Aristotelian physics and ideas based on it and consequently has abandoned St. Thomas whose teachings are but Aristotelian concepts applied to theology. This writer would have a re-statement of Catholic doctrine. He claims that it was not the intention of the Council of Trent to canonise Aristotelian terms when it declared that sanctifying grace was the *causa formalis* of justification and that it is lawful to substitute *another term* for *causa formalis* without changing the import of the Council's teaching. Now such a substitution is lawful only on the condition that the term substituted has the equivalent meaning of *causa formalis*; if the substituted term has another meaning, it is no longer that of *causa formalis* and it cannot be substituted. The "new theology" would substitute a new term with a new meaning, a meaning which corresponds to the requirements of evolving human life. It is the notion of the mutability of truth which basically vitiates the "new theology". Its understanding of truth is taken from the philosophy of action of Blondel. Truth is no longer the traditional "*adaequatio rei et intellectus*" but the "*adaequatio mentis et vitae*". The danger of such a definition of truth and of its effects in theology is evident. The Holy Office condemned twelve propositions of the philosophy of action, December 1st, 1924. Among them is the above definition of truth: "*Veritas non invenitur in ullo actu particulari intellectus quo haberetur conformitas cum objecto, ut aiunt scholastici, sed veritas est semper in fieri consistitque in adaequatione progressiva intellectus et vitae, scil., in motu quodam perpetuo, quo intellectus evolvere et explicare nititur id quod parit experientia vel exigit actio: ea tamen lege ut in toto progressu nihil unquam ratum fixumque habeatur*". The last of these condemned propositions has a bearing too on the "new theology": "*etiam post fidem acceptam, homo non debet quiescere in dogmatibus religionis eisque fixe et immobiliter adhaerere, sed semper anxius manere progrediendi ad ulteriorem veritatem, nempe evolvendo in novos sensus, immo et corrigendo id quod credit*".

A.C.P.



### A. *Subjects of the Enquiry.*

131 university students, youth leaders, seminarians and religious, between twenty and twenty-five years of age, all of them alumni of Catholic colleges.

FACTS AND FIGURES.<sup>1</sup> *Comment:* a) This age-group is perhaps the best from which to get information—sufficiently old not to be embarrassed by such an enquiry, and young enough to be able to give fairly accurate replies.

b) The particular subjects questioned by Father Smet were brought up in what we should consider almost ideal conditions—Catholic homes and Catholic secondary education.

### B. *Method of Enquiry.*

The purpose of the enquiry having been explained, each man was given a slip on which to answer the question, 'When and in what way did you first learn of things connected with the birth of children?'

They were first of all to put down the age, in figures, and after that,

P, if they learn from their parents, adding

f, if from their father,

m, if from their mother;

E, if from a priest;

C, if from companions;

S, if from secret investigation in books, etc.

To the 'S' or 'C' a plus or minus sign was added to indicate the good or bad effect of such instruction; and where instruction was given by a person not specified above, this was to be stated in full—e.g., doctor, teacher, brother, servant, etc.

Since instruction might have taken place in several stages, they were to indicate this, too, adding 'c' ('complete') when they learnt explicitly of the function of the father in procreation.

They were invited to add any comment they wished.

---

<sup>1</sup>In the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* for January, 1946, pages 44-60, Father Walter Smet, S.J., gives an account of an investigation he conducted to find out when and where boys get their knowledge of sex. This brief summary of his method and findings makes no attempt to answer the difficult question of when and how necessary instruction should be given; it simply indicates how and when it was given to a particular group of Catholic boys brought up in what we should consider ideal circumstances. We have omitted Father Smet's references to other similar enquiries, and his discussion of pastoral questions raised by the reports and comments he received. How far his figures apply to Australian conditions we do not know; nor are we concerned with their accuracy in point of detail: from the nature of the case we must be content with general indications.

Thus, a report—all were anonymous—might read:

' 7 Pm

11 S- E

17 C+ Doctor c.'

*Comment:* a) For local use I suggest the following 'code': M, mother; F, father; P, priest; T, teacher; C, companions; S, secret investigation.

b) Where several factors are present at the same stage (e.g., '11 S- E', above), I suggest that each be counted as part unit in the tables, not—as in Father Smet's—as a separate case.<sup>1</sup>

c) The age covers the year following the birthday: i.e., '7' means 'between the seventh and eighth birthdays'.

d) Though advisedly general, these reports furnished quite valuable statistical material, as will appear from an analysis.

*C. Table I: First Stage of Instruction.*

Age	Number of Subjects	Companions	Books	Instruction received from—			Others
				Priest	Parent		
20	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
19	1	—	—	—	1	—	—
18	3	1	—	1	1	—	—
17	3	—	—	3	—	—	—
16	9	—	5	1	1	—	2
15	16	8	5	4	1	—	—
14	16	5	5	6	2	—	—
13	16	7	4	5	1	—	—
12	16	5	6	6	1	—	—
11	22	17	3	2	4	—	—
10	14	7	4	2	2	—	—
9	8	7	3	—	1	—	—
8	5	5	2	—	—	—	—
7	3	3	—	—	—	—	—
6	1	1	—	—	—	—	—
Totals	131	66	37	30	15	—	2

*Comment:* a) As stated in Note 1, the totals in the second column do not agree with the sum of the five columns on the right. This makes it practically impossible to control some of Father Smet's calculations—for example his estimate that:

- b) 41% got their first instruction from companions;  
27% from secret investigation;  
22% from priests;  
10% from parents.

- c) Of those who were initiated by their companions, 60% were

<sup>1</sup>What I mean will be clear from the next section, where I reproduce one of Father Smet's tables, in which the sum of the separate C, S, E, P reports—148—is greater than the number of subjects of the investigation—131.

under 12, 98% under 16; and three out of four found the instruction harmful.

d) The median age<sup>2</sup> for intervention by parent or priest is 13½ medians—companions, 11½; secret investigation, 13).

e) Secret investigation was generally found harmful.

f) In only one case in ten did parents give any assistance; priests or parents in only one case in three.

*D. Table II: Completion of Instruction.*

Age	Number of Subjects	Instruction received from—					
		Companions	Books	Priest	Parent	Others	
Over 20 .....	14	—	1	12	1	—	
20 .....	3	—	2	1	—	—	
19 .....	10	1	4	5	—	—	
18 .....	7	—	2	4	—	1	
17 .....	20	1	6	13	1	—	
16 .....	13	3	2	7	1	—	
15 .....	14	1	7	4	2	—	
14 .....	16	1	6	10	—	—	
13 .....	10	2	6	2	—	—	
12 .....	3	—	1	2	—	—	
11 .....	3	1	—	2	—	—	
10 .....	1	—	—	—	—	1	
9 .....	2	1	—	—	—	1	
8 .....	1	1	—	—	—	—	
Totals	117	12	37	62	5	3	

*Comment:* a) Only 117 subjects indicated that their instruction was complete.<sup>3</sup>

b) 10% learnt from companions (Cf. Table I, 41%);

31% from secret investigation (27%);

52% from priests (22%);

4% from parents (10%).

c) Most of those over 15 who got instruction from companions found it helpful.

d) Parents play an even smaller part than before; though with priests (at the parents' request?) they now cover 56% of the cases.

e) Comparison of median ages again shows that parents and priests are late in the field:

15, for companions (Cf. Table I, 11½);

16, for secret investigation (13);

<sup>2</sup>By 'median age' is meant the statistical average age, i.e., the age at which half the subjects had had instruction. We give the medians as recalculated from the tables: Father Smet usually gives the year—13, for example, and not 13½. It is possible, too, that Father Smet is taking '12' for example, to mean 'between 11½ and 12½'; for his figures are generally lower than ours.

(i.e., considerably above the general median, 12½, and the particular

<sup>3</sup>Instruction was complete when it included explicit knowledge of the function of the father in procreation.

16 $\frac{3}{4}$ , general median (12 $\frac{1}{2}$ );

17 $\frac{1}{4}$ , for priests and parents (13 $\frac{3}{4}$ ).<sup>4</sup>

#### E. General Observations.

Father Smet relates that of the 131 subjects, 44 reported three stages of instruction, 44 two, and 43 one only. He gives detailed figures only for first and final stages—Tables I and II.

In 81 instances priests gave some instruction, parents in 26; in 42 cases, neither priest nor parent. And even where they did help, they were preceded in 50 instances by companions and in 15 by secret investigation; so that in only 24 cases—less than one in five of the total—did they intercede before the boy's curiosity had been aroused and to some extent satisfied.

It is noteworthy that boys very seldom got instruction from teachers,<sup>5</sup> youth leaders, doctors, etc.: only five possible cases are recorded in the two tables printed by Father Smet, last column, and one of these was a daily help.

J.W.D.

\* \* \* \*

In the Mass for the second Monday of Lent we read as the gospel of the day a section from the eighth chapter of the Gospel according to St. John (verses 21-29).

It records part of a conversation between  
PRINCIPIUM, QUI      Our Lord and the Jews on the occasion of  
ET LOQUOR VOBIS.      the Feast of Tabernacles some six months  
before the death of Our Saviour.

In it He warns the Jewish leaders that they will die in their sins and mentions expressly their sin of unbelief, which will cause them eternal ruin and involves many other sins.

In their anger they demand of Him: "Who art Thou?"

His reply, as we have it in the Missal from the Clementine Vulgate, is "Principium, qui et loquor vobis".

The Rheims-Challoner translation of the Latin is "The beginning, who also speak unto you".

This version of Our Lord's reply does not give the meaning of the Greek, although the Greek itself is susceptible of several translations.

The Vulgate has translated the accusative of the Greek noun "archē" with the article, by "principium".

<sup>4</sup>Father Smet's figures are 14 $\frac{1}{2}$ , 15, 16, 16.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Gerald Kelly, S.J., 'Moral Theology for Everybody', *Review for Religious*, 1945, and 'Qualities of Moral Guides', *id.*, 1946. Also Fleece, *Self Revelation of the Adolescent Boy*, Bruce, 1946.



This word, then, does not represent a nominative case at all, nor does the Latin word translate the sense of the Greek accusative. This is an adverbial accusative, and while such a use of the case occurs of course in Latin, it is far more common and of more varied significance in Greek.

The "*tēn archēn*" as here means either "from the beginning" or "certainly", "altogether" and, from this, with any negative idea "at all".

Examples of the use of the phrase in these senses are available from several Greek writers.

The "qui" of the Latin rendering of Our Lord's reply represents the Greek "*hoti*", but not accurately. The neuter relative "quod" would be satisfactory. Some Greek manuscripts, moreover, here suggest a question.

Having regard then to the variants which may accurately take the place of both "principium" and "qui", the reply of Our Saviour to the question: "Who art Thou?" would be

- 1) Even that which I tell you from the beginning, or
- 2) Certainly even that which I tell you, or
- 3) Why do I even speak to you at all?

All of these translations—two of them in a footnote—appear in the revision of the Rheims-Challoner version of the New Testament edited by the Episcopal Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in the United States and also in the revised Australian Edition of the Gospels based on that work.

J.P.

## Book Reviews

L'ENSEIGNEMENT DE SAINT PIERRE, par G. Thils, Professeur au Grand Séminaire de Malines. Deuxième Edition. [Etudes Bibliques] Gabalda, Paris, 1943.

This is a very useful little book of some 160 sextodecimo pages, but if approached in a less commendable way, it may prove very unreadable. It is not a *Théologie de saint Pierre* of the full, suggestive, satisfying and even fascinating type of which Père Prat, S.J., has left such an outstanding example in his *Théologie de saint Paul*. It is simply an orderly and clearly written statement of the teachings of the Prince of the Apostles, as these teachings may be gathered from the Acts and from the two canonical Epistles written by St. Peter himself.

The best way of getting full profit from this little book is to read in advance the first fifteen chapters of the Acts as well as the *prima* and *secunda Petri*. Otherwise M. l'Abbé Thils' exposition will only furnish its reader with a relatively dry and not at all gripping series of chapters embodying systematically the truths taught by St. Peter and recorded in the New Testament. The previous reading of the inspired texts will clothe the dry skeleton with nerves and skin and give the breath of life to the Academic synthesis. Best of all, let St. Peter be read in advance in the pages of the New Testament, then in Abbé Thils' little book, and yet once more in the pages of the New Testament. If we seem to ask too much, we shall say with that importunate man of the Roman forum: "Nil sine magno vita labore dedit mortalibus".

By way of criticism we only wish to mention that the authenticity of the second Epistle of St. Peter, as briefly discussed on p. 15, could be more judiciously qualified. The hypothesis of a disciple pseudonymously calling himself "Symeon Petros" is surely to be ruled out of court. At the same time no one will deny that the language of *secunda Petri* is very different in many respects from that in which Sylvanus expressed the Apostle's thoughts in the first letter. The details of composition, when a letter writer dictates to an amanuensis who is more of a *writer* than himself, must always be a mere matter of conjecture, unless we are authentically informed of the actual facts.

We would remind readers of the *A.C.R.* that this small volume belongs to the collection called *Etudes Bibliques*. Those volumes, coming from the Biblical School of Jerusalem or from authors having some connection, discipleship or friendship with it, are amongst the finest fruits of Catholic scholarship, and their publishers, J. Gabalda

and Company, of Rue Bonaparte, in the old Latin Quarter of Paris, are signally worthy of a large clientèle amongst clergy and religious and studious Catholic laity all the world over.

W.L.

\* \* \* \*

PREFACE TO RELIGION, by Rt. Rev. Fulton J. Sheen, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., Litt.D. New York. P. J. Kennedy & Sons. Pp. 228. 2.50 dollars.

It would not be easy correctly to judge this book by what is printed on its cover. It is true that Monsignor Sheen is well known in these parts. We have read about him often in the Catholic papers, and have heard his voice, too, when recordings of short addresses delivered in America were rebroadcasted from Station 2SM. But what of the title, "Preface to Religion"? The book indicates that Religion here means the practice of the True Religion revealed by Christ to His Church. So, the Preface to Religion is the knowledge of the revealed truths.

The second chapter deals with the nature of God—"What is God like?"; but the first chapter does not ask precisely—"Is there a God?" Monsignor Sheen prefers to leave out the *quinque viae* and to head it—"Are You Happy?" Apparently, he has found that this personal question is the best way to secure the interest of the man who neglects God. It is in line with the experience of Catholic Evidence speakers who have noticed that they get a good hearing when they talk about man and what he is for. The listener is interested in himself.

In dealing with revelation the full beauty of the Christian belief is unfolded. The supernatural life that was lost and regained for us, and the organic character of the True Church are clearly set down in the hope, no doubt, that the exposition of these truths will do more to help the non-Catholic than the apologist's defence of them.

The section of the Church is headed—"Is Religion Purely Individual?" A feature here is the way any vagueness that to-day attaches to the word "Church" is avoided by the etymological explanation and subsequent use throughout the chapter of the word "ecclesia". It is only in the last line that it is proclaimed that the "ecclesia" is the Catholic Church.

Those who have tried to explain what the True Church is like without, for the moment, saying which church it is, will undoubtedly welcome this device.

However, there may be many who would not care to say that "even unbaptized souls belong to it [the 'ecclesia'] *in intention* if they

live up to God's will according to the light of their conscience, and would accept Revelation if they knew about it".

"Belonging" when qualified here by "in intention" seems to be but "a mere shadow of its former self".

The frequency with which short sentences are used is outstanding, but the book should not be read quickly, else much that is concise will be missed. For example, this turns up in the midst of a paragraph on Christ's Redemptive work—"Suffering is always the form that love takes in an evil situation".

Monsignor Sheen's style should entice a Catholic to enthuse about his faith if, as yet, he has taken it for granted. His thinking is clear and the illustrations that abound are apt and topical.

*e.g.*, "You can quickly become tired of pleasures, but you never tire of joys. A boy thinks he never could get too much ice cream, but he soon discovers there is just not enough boy". The little girl who calls anyone she doesn't like a "fascist" is credited with "perhaps the best definition that has yet been given".

The publishers remark that the book "isn't for Catholics only, or for Protestants only, or for Jews only". Quite true. The revealed truths it expounds are for everyone—*omnes gentes*.

T.L.

\*

\*

\*

\*

"THEOLOGY AND SANITY." By F. J. Sheed, London. Sheed & Ward. 12/6.

The object of this book is to instruct the Catholic intellect with a view to setting the will firmly on the road to sanctity. We have a Catholic intellect when we live consciously in the presence of the realities that God through His Church has revealed, when we see God and the world and ourselves as the Church sees them. The Church lives, moves, thinks, in the world of reality, seeing reality as a whole and living wholly in it. Now, this is the only sane method of life; and if we do not see things as the Church sees them, we are not living in the world of reality, we do not see things as they really are; and that is a form of insanity. The only cure for this unhappy mental condition is the acquisition of theological knowledge, at least that minimum of it that is required by our dignity as men. Mr. Sheed, in his unique approach to his subject gives us a vivid illustration of his point: "If you were driving in a car, saw it heading straight for a tree, and called out to the driver to swerve or he would hit it; and if he answered: 'It is no good talking to me about trees' I'm a motorist not a botanist', you



would feel that he was carrying respect for the rights of the specialist too far. A tree is not only a fact of botany: it is a fact: God is not only a fact of religion: He is a fact. Not to see him is to be wrong about everything, which includes being wrong about one's self". And that is a definite form of insanity, unfortunately far too prevalent to-day when people live largely in a world of prejudice or imagination, not in the world of reality.

To acquire a knowledge of this real world we must think. Thinking is generally a laborious operation, and in our times it is a work which is impeded by our modern methods of education and social life. Thinking has degenerated, modern intellects have grown feeble, flabby, lethargic: consequently the purpose of the mind—to acquire truth, to know reality, to live sanely—is frustrated. This book is a challenge to the mental lethargy of the Christian mind, become stultified and well-nigh atrophied by want of healthy exercise.

Mr. Sheed divides his book into three sections, entitled: "God", whom you cannot "treat as an extra", "Creatures", who are best described as "nothingness worked upon by omnipotence", and "Oneself", outlining the mental attitude we must adopt. This book is a veritable Jacob's ladder for the Catholic layman, stretching from heaven to earth, and from earth to heaven it will take you rung by rung through the fascinating mysteries of our Faith, God, infinite and eternal, Trinity and Unity! humanity, finite, created in time, fallen and redeemed by Christ; the individual man born into the life of nature, reborn into the life of Grace, united with Christ in the Church which is His Mystical Body, aided by angels, hindered by devils, destined for heaven, in peril of hell. And if the ascent becomes difficult, or your foot begins to slip, the kindly hand of an understanding guide is ever-ready to support you.

*Theology and Sanity* is alive with superb illustrations, vivifying freshness of thought and expression. It is not to be devoured all at once, but digested slowly. Priests will not look here for theological details (it is no new contribution to theology), but they will find a great help in the clarity of expression and the presentation of the matter in a form suitable for the laity. Study-groups will find in it the treasury of Catholic thought for which they are continually seeking. This book places Religion right where it should be; to place it anywhere else is mentally unwholesome.

We would say that only those who have reached the resplendent heights of extraordinary Sanctity can afford to miss this book. That leaves quite a few of us to read it. If you go on this fascinating

journey of exploration with Mr. Sheed, prepared to make the necessary mental effort which the book calls for, you will find it immensely rewarding.

T.M.

\*

\*

\*

\*

REGIONALISM IN AUSTRALIA. F. K. Maher, M.A., LL.B.,  
and J. G. Sullivan. Araluen Publishing Company, Melbourne.  
1946. Pp. 56.

In this age of the atomic bomb, when a nation's defence potential is equal to its national income, maximum economic development is essential. And in this age of the atomic state—the state which regards its citizens as atoms to be machine-governed into some sort of order—the maximum of decentralized authority is essential. These two essentials, economic development and political decentralization, are the aims of Regionalism, and to it they give a noteworthy and topical significance.

The subject is taken up in the booklet under review. The claims of the authors are modest. They do not profess to be experts, but to be popularizers of the philosophy and facts of Regionalism. Their treatment of the subject is none the less sound and comprehensive. The thesis is that Australia is an unbalanced community with as much as half of its population, and perhaps more of its life, concentrated in a few cities. This lack of balance is visible in almost every aspect of life. population, education, industry, housing, political and administrative life. It ignores the highest economic development possible, and tends to an over-centralized political system and administration. The remedy is a "balance between city, town and country—a sound distribution of resources, population and amenities". This is to be effected by regional planning and regional self-government. A region is an "area of land which has natural geographic boundaries and which is united by the characteristics of its natural resources and common social and economic interests". Regional planning "should be to investigate and obtain detailed knowledge of the State's material and human resources . . . and to use this knowledge in preparing plans for future development which will give the maximum benefits possible to the people of the State and the nation". Regional planning thus aims to offset the legacy of an unplanned past, and to secure a more efficient and harmonious future development. Regional self-government aims to defeat the trend towards the omnipotent state and to safeguard the rights of the individual and smaller body. There is little to question here. Pius XI

wrote, "It is an injustice, a grave evil, and a disturbance of right order for a larger and higher organization to arrogate to itself functions which can be performed efficiently by smaller and lower bodies". These words have particular reference to regional self-government.

One omission is perhaps worth referring to. Regionalism can do much for the reclamation of societies which, because of their isolation, have become a serious social problem. The coal miners of N.S.W. immediately come to mind. Because the coal fields were not developed as a balanced region with diversified industries, life and culture, the miners have become a race apart with a grievance. How serious this can be for the peace and health of society needs no demonstration. Its seriousness particularly recommended the advantages of Regionalism to the late Prime Minister, John Curtin.

Regionalism was very prominent a year or two ago, but seems to have receded recently. The authors note progress made by Federal and State bodies responsible for Regionalism, but there is a danger that this important ideal may become a "political plaything of the moment". Whatever the fate of Regionalism, it has been commendably brought to the average reader by this booklet.

P.F.

\*

\*

\*

\*

DEMOCRACY IN AUSTRALIA. An Essay in Organic Reconstruction. James G. Murtagh, M.A., Catholic Social Guild, Melbourne. 1946. (70 pages, 3/6).

Democracy in Australia assails the problem of human freedom in the modern highly developed and complex state. It is a booklet of principles which are taken from the social encyclicals, and reflect a close acquaintance with such reputed authors as Sheed, Nell-Bruning and Sturzo. It is also an endeavour to apply these principles to the phenomena of political life in Australia.

The author is to be commended for his brief but clear treatment of definitions and principles. He is to be commended, too, for being almost the first in the field to take up in book form the short-comings of the democracy we know, and to suggest its dangerous and healthy trends. He points to the emergence of a new middle class, which may lead us through the Scylla and Charybdis of unrestricted Capitalism and extreme Labour or Communism. He deftly refers to the institutions which could be the basis of a vocational order as envisaged by Pius XI, and to the State's tendency to devolve some of its authority and administration. He has a brief but useful treatment of socialization,

which illustrates both the dangers and the possibilities for good of the A.L.P. At the same time, the author is not unaware of the political inarticulateness of the new middle class, the fierce class war which greatly prejudices any vocational order, and the tendency for socialization to be the public ownership of property rather than the solidarity that comes from the reign of Justice and Charity.

It is hoped that this small booklet is the fore-runner of a larger work. Its subjects are so important as to merit further and more searching treatment. In its present form, however, it is a valuable document for any reader interested in the great problem of our time. It brings to the Catholic the moral principles that should guide his political outlook, and breathes the enthusiasm of the Christian social student working for a better world.

P.F.

\* \* \* \*

LA FIAMMA. An Italo-Australian Newspaper.

The advent of the Capuchin Fathers to Sydney has, in conjunction with Father La Rosa, already produced this promising instrument of Apostolate. In the pages of the *A.C.R.* we can only bid it a hundred thousand welcomes and express a hope that it will be worthy of its name: *La Fiamma*, that is, a happy means of keeping the light of their ancestral faith and the fire of Christian charity alive amongst the Italo-Australians of Sydney and beyond. The torch figuring on the title-page suggests that we can express this wish in the memorable words of a "poet who beautified the sect which was otherwise inferior to the rest": *Vitai lampada tradat*. Classical scholars will not be offended by such a slight adaptation of the Lucretian phrase.

W.L.

\* \* \* \*

THE KINGS OF THE EARTH, 103 pp., by Dunne Owen, being Part I of the History Syllabus published by the Catholic Education Office, Melbourne. Printed and distributed by the Advocate Press.

It is just twelve months since we reviewed Parts III and V of this series of Catholic History Readers. The present publication, chronologically the first of the series, has been prepared for children aged eight or a little over (Grade 3). The book is divided into sections: (1) Stories of the East (Abraham, Moses, David, Babylon), (2) Stories of Greece (Troy, Esther, Xerxes, Pericles), (3) Stories of Rome (the Wolf Children, Coriolanus, Cincinnatus, Brennus the Gaul,



Hannibal, Caesar), and (4) The Coming of Christ. It is all very well done, and written in language simple enough for the young pupil. The good-quality paper, large-type print, and delightful illustrations make the volume attractive and help the story on its way.

History, as taught in the Catholic school, must show the grand object of God's designs in the government of this world. And so it must begin at the beginning and trace the story of mankind through the great empires of the past. It must also stress the importance of sacred history, and show that God chose one nation to carry through the ages the traditions of religion till Christ should come and establish His kingdom. Young children will not, of course, grasp the continuity in man's story, nor behold in the series of human events the ruling hand of God's providence. It is enough that the writer of history has done so. The publication under review is a good example of the correct way to tackle history. We could wish, however, that the story had gone back even a little further into the past and included a chapter on the Creation, the Deluge, and the Dispersion of men after the deluge—for there you have the very beginnings of history.

Dunne Owen has performed his task well—*The Kings of the Earth* deservedly takes its place beside the other numbers of the series already published.

C.S.D.

\*

\*

\*

\*

TWELVE TALES of the Life and Adventures of SAINT IMAGINUS, edited by Frances Margaret McGuire, with illustrations by Betty Arnott. Sheed & Ward, London, 1946; pp. 71; price 6--.

Publications from Sheed & Ward are always welcome. "Twelve Tales" is no disappointment, although its appeal is quaint, not profound, and its style is whimsical, if not shocking. "Priests in films, wearing straw hats and crooning; and now a book about a saint whose name does not appear in the Calendar! Imagine it! What's the Church coming to?" says Mrs. Grundy. Allay your fears, patient reader, for the shocks in "Twelve Tales" are pleasant, and instructive: they are products of the thoughtful mind and delicate pen of Frances McGuire—wife of Paul, by the way; but famous in her own right. Her St. Imagus, who "seems to have been born of good, though respectable parents", is a new figure in hagiography. His antecedents are given most solemnly, according to the best tradition, and, how wonderful! some of the stories of his life concern his "travailes and admirable

adventures in the Fifth part of the World (then—) recently discovered, cui nomen Australia incognita". Indeed, "legend has it that Imaginus was born at Orroroo in South Australia", although the reader will readily guess that his name better suggests his birthplace; and "while yet a young man he served as curate or junior priest in the parish of Wog-Wog, in the desert beyond Port Augusta". Remembering that he was a monk of the order of St. Simplicitas, his experiences with the "wicked young men" are not unbelievable. Some ruffians had set about the saint and had pursued him with stones: "nor could he fail to be struck by the accuracy with which they aimed the missiles at his person". The simple good man, returning with a bat and a ball, taught the scoundrels a manly game whereat to indulge their weakness for throwing and hitting. En cricket! His Parish Priest, delighted on seeing the former ruffians at friendly play, could not contain his astonishment, and said: "We will have a cricket match, and take up a collection for the church debt". The Parish Priest began to praise Imaginus; but the holy man would have none of it. Surveying the game, and taking a book from his pocket, he humbly said: "I learnt it from Grace". As the blurb says, Imaginus is a saint whom it is easier to admire than to imitate: easiest of all, perhaps, simply to enjoy. His gift of transposing himself through time, so that at one moment he is back in the past inventing the game of cricket, and at another causing a miraculous harvest of corn to spring up among the skyscrapers: his ability to converse with animals, and the humility with which he accepts rebukes from them: his gift of miracles, exercised at times to the consternation of his superiors: all these graces we may delight in without hoping to reproduce. His adventures with lions, with angels, with stockbrokers, with bricklayers, are told with verve. The stories out-mode Alban Butler in his most credulous flights, but the moral to each is clear and telling, as old and as new as Christianity itself: the Providence and Mercy of God; charity; humility; obedience; judging others; the conversion of the sinner; the end and the means; diligentibus Deum omnia cooperantur in bonum. The stories are told in Aesop fashion and are delightfully illustrated.

C.S.P.

\*

\*

\*

\*

MYSTIC IN MOTLEY. The Life of St. Philip Neri. By Theodore Maynard. pp. x, 250. Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, U.S.A., 1946. 2 doll. 50 c.

Theodore Maynard is well known as a Catholic poet and biographer



in America. He is a convert to the faith. He was born in India of parents who met on board ship on the way out from England. He was educated in England, and, after varied religious experiences in his young days, embraced the faith, his conversion following his admiration for the social ideas of Belloc and others. He has spent much of his life in America.

In "Mystic in Motley" the author's expressed purpose is to give a "personal sketch" of St. Philip. In this he succeeds very well, and we have an adequate idea of the saint's personality by the time we have reached the end of the book.

The author claims no originality of research for his work—there seems to be little room left for that—but he has used judiciously the works of others.

We follow Philip from Florence, his birthplace, to San Germano, which was for him but a stepping stone to Rome, to which he came when eighteen years old.

He did considerable apostolic work amongst men in Rome even before he was ordained in obedience to his confessor, when nearly thirty-six years of age.

We are told of the early stages of St. Philip's Oratory, where his followers—cleric and lay—met for prayers and meditation. Here there was lay preaching, and excellent music by such men as Palestrina was introduced to provide a break in the more serious pursuits of the company.

How the Congregation of the Oratory developed without any intention on the part of St. Philip, who was essentially an individualist, is clearly explained.

Mystical phenomena occurred early in Philip's life. The well-known enlarging of his heart and the curving of his ribs to contain it took place in his young days. His prayer and especially the celebration of Mass were frequently the occasions of extraordinary happenings.

In his manner of dealing with others, and himself also, there was that in Philip which places him in some respects amongst those saints who are to be admired rather than imitated.

He had a habit of imposing grotesque penances on others and of acting fantastically himself at times.

The penances, it is true, taught humility, and his own manner of acting was designed to prevent public manifestations of his fervour by distracting himself from the thought of holy things, which so easily

(and inconveniently at times) carried him away, or again to making people have a poor opinion of him.

Although the author has a chapter on St. Philip as the Apostle of Rome, one has not from this chapter a very clear idea of how he directly affected the people of the city as a whole.

The author is also at pains to make it clear that he follows a "via media" in regard to the miracles and other wonders recorded of St. Philip. Few would quarrel with the position he takes up, but he seems to belabour it somewhat.

It is extraordinary how many other saints enter the life of St. Philip. Camillus de Lellis was a penitent of his and was inspired by him later to found his order. Charles Borromeo was his great friend. and Ignatius and Francis Xavier also shared his friendship. There came a time when the letters of Xavier almost induced Philip and his friends to go to the East as Missionaries. Francis de Sales was in Rome in 1591 and knew Philip. Edmund Campion was amongst the group of English Missionaries who, before leaving Rome in 1580, called to see Philip and obtain his blessing.

J.P.